DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 063 IR 050 876

AUTHOR Ryan, Constance V.
TITLE A Survey of Print and Nonprint Materials in College Libraries.
PUB DATE May 84
NOTE 150p.; M.S. Thesis in Education, State University of New York at Oswego.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Audiovisual Aids; *Audiovisual Centers; Audiovisual Coordinators; College Libraries; Employment Practices; Geographic Location; Higher Education; *Learning Resources Centers; *Library Facilities; *Library Materials; Library Personnel; Library Research; *Nonprint Media; Predictor Variables; Questionnaires; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire was administered to 400 randomly selected four-year academic institutions to gather information about integration of print and nonprint materials, provision of media facilities, and degree of cooperation between audiovisual centers and libraries. Responses received from 266 institutions (67%) were subjected to the posteriori chi-square test for independence to determine if the variables of college size or geographical location resulted in significant differences. The following conclusions were reached: 77% to 85% of the institutions surveyed have attempted some integration of print and nonprint resources; nearly 50% of the responding institutions have a staff working closely together on print and nonprint materials; respondents are fairly equal in maintaining separate print and nonprint facilities with separate directors; size of college does influence organizational pattern; geographical location does not influence media integration; most institutions desiring integrated facilities and/or staff have already achieved such integration; and individuals with library degrees are most likely to be the administrator of integrated facilities. The survey and results of the survey sent to the respondents are appended. A list of references is included. (Author/THC)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED251063

# A SURVEY OF PRINT AND NONPRINT MATERIALS IN COLLEGE LIBRARIES

CONSTANCE V. RYAN

A Thesis
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the degree of
Master of Science in Education

Department of Audiovisual
Communications and Technology
Professional Studies Division
College of Arts and Sciences
State University of New York
Oswego

May 1984

Advisor:.....

Advisor:.....

Dean of
Graduate Studies:.....

IR050876

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Constance V. Ryan
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Constance V. Ryan

# A SURVEY OF PRINT/NONPRINT INTEGRATION IN SELECTED FOUR-YEAR ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS

## ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted among randomly selected four-year academic institutions to gather information concerning integration of print and nonprint materials, provision of media facilities, and degree of cooperation between AV centers and libraries. Responses received from 67% of those surveyed were subjected to the a posteriori chi-square test for independence to determine if the variables of college size or geographical location resulted in any significant differences. The following conclusions were reached:

1) 77%-85% have attempted some integration of print and nonprint resources;

2) nearly one-half of responding institutions have a staff working closely together on print and nonprint materials;

3) respondents are fairly equal in maintaining separate print and nonprint facilities with separate directors;

4) size of college does influence organizational pattern;

5) geographical location does not influence media integration;

6) most institutions desiring integrated facilities and/or staff have already achieved such integration;

7) individuals with library degrees are most likely to be the administrator of integrated facilities.

ED180250

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| List of Tables | | iv |
| Chapter | | |
| I. | The Problem | 1 |
| | Background | 1 |
| | Technology | 3 |
| | Patterns of Service | 5 |
| | Statement of the Problem | 6 |
| II. | Review of Literature | 8 |
| | Information Resources | 8 |
| | Policies | 10 |
| | Administration and Organization | 12 |
| | Organizational Structure | 15 |
| | Integration | 17 |
| | Future Role | 18 |
| | Conclusion | 19 |
| III. | Methods and Procedures | 21 |
| | Overview | 21 |
| | Sponsoring Agency | 21 |
| | Sample | 22 |
| | Nature of the Questionnaire | 23 |
| | Distribution of the Survey | 24 |
| | Final Sample | 25 |
| | Hypotheses | 26 |
| | Date Analysis and Techniques | 26 |
| IV. | Results of the Survey | 28 |
| | The Sample | 28 |
| | Final Sample by Geographic Region | 29 |
| | General Survey Results | 31 |
| | Setting | 33 |
| | Funding | 34 |
| | Library Book Holdings | 36 |
| | Audiovisual Holdings | 38 |
| | Media Production | 40 |
| | No Media Production Unit | 40 |
| | Media Production Unit | 42 |
| | Administration of AV Production Unit | 43 |
| | Physical Facilities, Single Director | 45 |
| | Equipment | 47 |
| | Audiovisual Equipment Distribution | 47 |
| | Individual Equipment Use | 49 |
| | Equipment Maintenance | 51 |
| | Staff | 53 |
| | Physical Building | 62 |
| | Loan Policies | 66 |

Bibliographic Access 67
Administration 73
One Unit 75
Recent Merger 77
Merger Consideration 78
Administrative Patterns 79
Autonomous Directors 80
Reporting Officer 82
Title of Reporting Officer 83
One Director 85
Education of Director 87
One Degree 88
Summary 91

V. Conclusions .....92

Response By Sample 92
Staff Integration 94
Separate Facilities and Directors 96
Organizational Pattern 97
Geographic Location 98
Integration 99
Qualifications of Directors 99
Possible Future Research 100

Appendices.....104

A: Survey 105
B: Results of Survey Returned to Respondents 115

References.....138

LIST OF TABLES


| Table | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Random Sample for Mailing | 28 |
| 2. | Responses | 29 |
| 3. | Area and Population | 30 |
| 4. | Responses by Region | 31 |
| 5. | College Setting | 33 |
| 6. | College Setting, by Region | 34 |
| 7. | Financial Support | 34 |
| 8. | Financial Support, by Region | 35 |
| 9. | Number of Volumes in Library | 36 |
| 10. | Matrix of Observed/Expected Frequencies-Item 6 | 37 |
| 11. | Number of Volumes in Library, by Region | 38 |
| 12. | Approximate Number of Audiovisual Titles | 39 |
| 13. | Matrix of Observed/Expected Frequencies-Item 7 | 39 |
| 14. | Number of Audiovisual Titles, by Region | 40 |
| 15. | No Production Unit | 41 |
| 16. | No Production Unit, by Region | 41 |
| 17. | Media Production Only | 42 |
| 18. | Media Production Only, by Region | 43 |
| 19. | One Director | 44 |
| 20. | Matrix of Observed/Expected Frequencies-Item 11 | 44 |
| 21. | One Director, by Region | 45 |
| 22. | Production and Distribution in One Building | 46 |
| 23. | Production and Distribution in One Building, by Region | 46 |
| 24. | Audiovisual Classroom Equipment Distribution | 47 |
| 25. | Matrix of Observed/Expected Frequencies-Item 14 | 48 |

26. Audiovisual Classroom Equipment Distribution, by Region 48
27. Individual Use Audiovisual Equipment Loan 49
28. Matrix of Observed/Expected Frequencies-Item 15 50
29. Individual Use Audiovisual Equipment Loan, by Region 50
30. Audiovisual Equipment Repair 51
31. Matrix of Observed/Expected Frequencies-Item 16A 52
32. Matrix of Observed/Expected Frequencies-Item 16B 52
33. Audiovisual Equipment Repair, by Region 53
34. Print and Nonprint Staff Work Closely Together 54
35. Matrix of Observed/Expected Frequencies-Item 17 54
36. Print and Nonprint Staff Work Closely Together, by Region 55
37. Integrated Staff 55
38. Integrated Staff, by Region 56
39. Staff Meetings 57
40. Staff Meetings, by Region 57
41. Coordination between Library and Media Production Staff 58
42. Coordination between Library and Media Production Staff, by Region 58
43. Differentiation in Titles, Status and/or Pay 59
44. Matrix of Observed/Expected Frequencies-Item 21 60
45. Differention in Titles, Status and/or Pay, by Region 60
46. A Staff Merger Is Being Considered 61
47. A Staff Merger Is Being Considered, by Region 61

48. Library and AV Center Located in Same Building 62
49. Matrix of Observed/Expected Frequencies-Item 23 62
50. Library and AV Center Located in Same Building, by Region 63
51. Most Types of Media Serviced in One Building 64
52. Most Types of Media Serviced in One Building, by Region 64
53. Media Dispersed through the Library 65
54. Media Dispersed through the Library, by Region 65
55. The Same Loan Policies 66
56. The Same Loan Policies, by Region 67
57. Union Catalog of Audiovisual and Print Materials 68
58. Union Catalog of Audiovisual and Print Materials, Region 68
59. Full Cataloging in Separate Media Catalog 69
60. Full Cataloging in Separate Media Catalog, by Region 70
61. Short Cataloging with Local Standards 70
62. Short Cataloging with Local Standards, by Region 71
63. Cataloging in the Same Department 72
64. Cataloging in the Same Department, by Region 72
65. One Unit Administratively 73
66. Matrix of Observed/Expected Frequencies-Item 31 74
67. One Unit Administratively, by Region 74
68. Always Existed as One Unit 75
69. Matrix of Observed/Expected Frequencies-Item 32 76
70. Always Existed as One Unit, by Region 76
71. Merger within the Past Five Years 77

72. Merger within the Past Five Years, by Region 77
73. An Administrative Merger Is Being Seriously Considered 78
74. An Administrative Merger Is Being Seriously Considered, by Region 79
75. Separate Directors, One of Whom Is Coordinator 80
76. Separate Directors, One of Whom Is Coordinator, by Region 80
77. Separate Directors, Each Reporting to an Administrative Officer 81
78. Matrix of Observed/Expected Frequencies-Item 36 81
79. Separate Director, by Region 82
80. Directors Report to the Same Administrative Officer 83
81. Directors Report to the Same Administrative Officer, by Region 83
82. Reporting Officer 84
83. Reporting Officer, by Region 85
84. One Director 85
85. Matrix of Observed/Expected Frequencies-Item 39 86
86. One Director, by Region 86
87. Two Degrees 87
88. Two Degrees, by Region 88
89. One Degree 89
90. One Degree, by Region 89
91. Qualifications of Director 90
92. Qualifications of Director, by Region 90

# CHAPTER I

# THE PROBLEM

## Background

Libraries have been an accepted part of the American academic scene since the establishment of the first college in the New World. John Harvard bequeathed "half his property and all his library" to Harvard College upon his death in 1638 (Morison, 1936, p.9). When Justin Winsor, Harvard librarian, opened the library to students in the 1880's, his "fundamental principle that books should be used to the largest extent possible and with the least trouble" was revolutionary (Morison, 1936).

Library holdings are one of the criteria used for evaluating the viability of a college's curricular offerings. To provide such support, the academic library should offer at least as much variety in the types of learning materials as can be found at the lower levels in elementary and secondary schools. Familiarity with the academic library scene and the literature concerned with the materials, organization and provision of media services indicated, however, that in proportion to quantity of material, higher education lags well behind the public schools in providing clientele with adequate diversity of media. In 1968, the Standards for College Libraries failed to recognize a need for integrated collections, and thus failed to provide guidelines for nonprint collections. The

Standards merely stated that, "every college library should have nonprint resources appropriate to instructional needs" without elaborating on the range or extent of materials or staffing. Hardesty (1980) concludes that

> Several important concerns were not included in the 1975 Standards precisely because there was no body of supporting literature which could be used to set forth accepted and acceptable standards - these included the areas of measures of library effectiveness and productivity, nonprint resources and services, and program evaluation. (p. 3)

A survey of California state universities and colleges (Daniel, 1975) indicated that nonprint holdings were marginal and mostly uncataloged, thus limiting access.

In 1973, Ellison stated that "Even though many of the experiments are presently confined to community colleges, recent indications point to acceptance of the learning resource center concept on over 35 four-year college and university campuses" (p. 1). Burlingame (1976) agreed that community colleges have led the way in accepting the concept of library provision of multi-media at the higher educational level, while Boyle concluded: "It is apparent that academic libraries have a distance to go in catching up with media-minded community college and school libraries" (Boyle, 1977, p. xiii). Totten (1977) stated that public and academic librarians almost without exception come to the administration of multi-media resources unprepared to treat them as library materials.

Technology

Technological improvements have made human knowledge more easily available. Beginning with movable type, progressing through micro formats, and continuing with ever-expanding media formats, the sheer quantity of information has caused critical problems for storage and distribution. The very abundance of learning resources has increased the problems of organization and dissemination of knowledge. The all too prevalent solution to the selection, processing and storage problems of varied media formats is simply not to get involved. The technological revolution caught most colleges without an appropriate framework for developing such services. The Hayward report indicated that studies by the Commission on Utilization of College Teaching Resources and by the Division of Audiovisual Communications of the National University Extension Association, have shown that

> (a) there are few well-developed service units which provide all-inclusive services, and (b) the adoption of or experimentation with new technological innovations is limited and uneven. (California State College at Hayward, 1964, p. 25)

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education stated that

> nonprint information, illustration, and instructional software components should be maintained as part of a unified informational-instructional resource that is cataloged and stored in ways that facilitate convenient retrieval as needed by students. (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1972, p. 34)

Instructional materials found in college and university

collections should consist of the same types of materials found in all other levels of education: for example, motion pictures, 2x2 slides, overhead transparencies, audio recordings and videotapes.

Prior to the Twentieth Century, the only formal means of widespread communication was the printing press, but among the strategies adopted in the post-war years of this century in the search for more efficient and effective means of education was increased development and use of media. Instructional media has been used in referring to any and all devices which aid in the presentation of instruction, present the instruction itself and/or encourage learning. Audiovisual as a descriptive term for the field of media utilization becomes less accurate and inclusive with each passing year. Originally conceived as instructional aids, many of the newer media are now utilized to ease and enrich individual learning, as well as to assist classroom instruction. Presentation of these materials requires the availability of necessary equipment and a system of distributing and maintaining such equipment. As late as 1971, Ralph Ellsworth felt that audiovisual developments had not been taken seriously enough but that they were going to play a role that would make the library very different (Enright, 1972, p.9). Shores calls the different formats of media the "generic book - all of the media in all their physical form" (1973, p. 130).

Patterns of Service

Our historically familiar academic library is being rivaled by Learning Resources Centers, Audiovisual Centers, and other facilities with diverse names, serving to supplement, or to some extent, replace, the book world of tradition. During the 1960's when funds were plentiful, many campuses developed separate facilities to respond to student and faculty needs for variety in media presentation. Separate collections, separate staffs and separate administrators presided over separate domains: print versus nonprint. The accepted practice was that "libraries and audiovisualists should cooperate but should not integrate their services" (Shores, 1973, p. 33). Lewis (1971) admits that there is little disagreement as to the need and value in providing services and resources which go beyond the printed page. However, as he points out, the big problem is in defining what such a center really is, what it should encompass and how it relates to other library functions.

As dollars for education have become less plentiful, the economics of separate establishments has come into question. Coordination, consolidation, or at the least, cooperation should be the keynote. If a library is to remain vital, it can no longer maintain the stance that the book is the only viable carrier of information and communication which it is mandated to provide. Technological developments have provided many different

modes of expression. Modern media and technology are communication aids - an integral part of almost every learning experience. Unique means of expression made possible by each new medium have added new dimensions of communication. Use of a wide variey of media and technology has become a common characteristic of everyday life.

It should follow, therefore, that the criterion in any medium is not format itself; the criterion should be the value of the content. Le Clerq points out that "the need for non-print materials to support the teaching/learning process is acute" (1977, p. 75). The American Library Association maintains that audiovisual materials are an integral part of modern instruction and that every college library must concern itself with them; academic libraries have the responsibility of supplying students and faculty with resource materials regardless of format.

Statement of the Problem

> The need for non-print materials to support the teaching/learning process is acute. If libraries do not collect information regardless of format, other campus agencies will assume this mission. Such agencies as a-v centers, and instructional materials centers tend to be equipment oriented, lack a means of generating funds for purchasing materials, and do not have the training or skills to organize and service non-print collections. Access to these resources for both faculty and students will suffer if libraries fail to assume a mandate to collect information regardless of format. (Le Clerq, 1977, p. 75)

If one accepts the above as a true statement of current practices, it would appear that print-oriented academic libraries are inadequately serving educational

requirements. Before accepting such a premise, however, it is necessary to have access to facts concerning the present "state of the art."

1. Are more academic libraries building integrated collections of print and nonprint materials, or are separate specialized agencies being established?

2. Are AV Centers and libraries being integrated physically, administratively and/or in staff?

3. Are students and faculty being provided with learning materials and services in the way best suited to provide easy, complete access?

## CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### Information Resources

In a study of organizational characteristics in four academic facilities, Burlingame points out that "Research in the area of this investigation has been lacking, with the majority of the literature being theoretical or descriptive in nature" (1974, p. 9). He further states that few research studies have been completed dealing with the learning resources concept in higher education. Nelson (1981) reports the findings of a survey sent in 1971 and again in 1980 to selected university library directors in each state. This questionnaire was meant to determine changes in administrative and physical relationships between the libraries and audiovisual instructional centers. Although the 1971 response was only 37% (as compared to 64% in 1981), the following conclusions were drawn:

> (1) fewer libraries and media centers had separate directors in 1980, and the effectiveness of those relationships had increased, (2) the number of respondents favoring combining of print and non-print materials in the teaching-learning process had increased by 14%, (3) the number of non-print instructional materials budgets administered by the campus media center with an increase of library and departmental funds for this purpose had decreased slightly; and (4) the number of media directors reporting to the library directors had increased. (Nelson, 1981, p.1)

In 1980, there were fewer library and media centers with separate directors, while joint administrative and

physical relationships increased. It was felt that the effectiveness of the relationships had improved over the nine year span.

Quinly (1971) believed that it was becoming increasingly obvious that a major portion of informational resources will be in non-book formats, with libraries expected to assume the role of an independent learning center furnishing programmed materials and electronic access to data banks of multi-media resources. Agreeing with this conclusion, Akeroyd (1973) disavowed that there is intent to suggest that the printed word has become obsolete as an information carrier but stressed that nonprint information media have come to be accepted as primary information sources in their own right. Acceptance of new media should help, rather than hinder, libraries to make an increasingly valuable contribution to the current future needs of its clientele (Enright, 1972).

Exploitation of existing and future improvements in communication systems will be a major factor in enlarging the library's opportunity to perform its educational functions (Massman, 1977). "The current expansion of media use in education is directed at increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of learning" (McPheeters, 1980, p. 1). Asheim maintained that the new media is NOT in conflict with the library ideal but rather a contemporary expression of it, utilizing the new tools to accomplish traditional objectives. The 1975 Standards for College Libraries does

recognize that the "inherent unity of recorded information" necessitates the acquisition and use of all formats within the library while conceding that

> higher education has thus far too little experience with non-print library materials to permit tenable generalizations to be made about their quantitative requirements. (p. 279)

With public acceptance of media resources, those who resist will find they must compete with facilities which are willing to accept the challenge (Quinly, 1971). The use of media and technology is seen as an evolution taking place in the contemporary college library (Ely, 1971). The role, and the financial support of the library will be diluted if parallel activities develop (Quinly, 1971). It must be recognized that libraries are concerned with information no matter in what form. In some cases, it may not be practical for a library to extend its area of operation, but the recognition of new media and its implications can provide an opportunity for re-examining traditional library operations (Enright, 1972).

Policies

> Media is without doubt the keyword of today's development in library service, with service implying utilization of all that is necessary to the student's individualized needs. (Ducote, 1972, p. 734)

However, the nature of the library's commitment to media will depend upon the extent of their use in the instructional process. To assume that all institutions should aim at total integration is probably as unwise as to

completely ignore non-book materials. Librarians must be fully aware of the problems and possibilities of new media, examining them in relation to the role and functions of each particular library. The basic criterion for learning materials must be the extent to which the materials contribute to the curriculum and to the learning experience of the students (Ellison, 1973).

Enright (1972) outlines several courses of action to the library in relation to newer media materials : (1) a positive decision to exclude them, confining interest to conventional material, (2) acceptance of the materials and providing "passive" storage, (3) becoming actively involved in amalgamating book and non-book media for the purpose of assisting the learning, teaching, and research activities of its community, and (4) doing nothing, ignoring media developments in the hope that the problem will eventually disappear.

It seems clear that there is no stereotyped answer to the matter of multi-media materials and libraries. Any number of approaches is possible depending upon the individual library, its function, user needs, commitments, pattern of past development and resources available. A single solution is unlikely to emerge (Lewis, 1971). As Langhoff (1980) stressed, the type of organization for any given situation must depend on

> the philosophy and goals of the institution, the available curriculum support services, the articulation between the various components of the institution, the people of the institution,

> and the resources available. (Langhoff, 1980, p. 11)

Since libraries have developed a great variety of objectives with equal diversity in practical operations, new media involvement is unlikely to change the fundamentally variable pattern. It must be the educational philosophy of the institution and the way it is translated by faculty and staff, which dictates how the library functions (Enright, 1972). If the library serves as the whole focus of the educational process where students learn independently, its approach to the new media will differ greatly from the custodial library. The key to a learning resource center is service and management more than storage and material (Brown, 1963). McPheeters (1980) pointed out that the "present day learning resource center is a direct descendant of the library" (p.1).

Administration and Organization

The way in which media production and library services are organized within an educational institution varies according to the aims and objectives of the institution. There are as many administrative organizations as there are people and institutions. A plan for housing learning resources at any given college or university depends upon the following critical variables:

> (1) the methods of instruction used, (2) the students to be served, (3) the faculty to be served, and (4) the local concept of learning resources. (California State College at Hayward, 1964, p. 13)

To exert an effective influence on education, media must be organized in such a way that teachers and students have access to them. Nonprint media must be related to the print collections of the library. The relationship, not the difference between book and non-book materials needs to be stressed. Three major trends evident in the production of new media favor their integration with print materials: (1) miniaturization (more compact materials and lighter equipment); (2) simplification (more "fool-proof" materials permitting open access); (3) combination of various media devices and techniques providing ease of use (Enright, 1972).

Although there is experimentation taking place at the college level, it should not be taken as an indication of general acceptance of the unified concept. In some institutions, the nonprint technologies are handled in a separate center operated completely separate from, and unrelated to, the library. As Bartlett (1972) cautioned, in such cases, resistance often develops on the part of the audiovisual staff and/or the library staff toward any form of integration or incorporation, creating problems in provision of learning resources to students and faculty. Timpano forcefully states this view:

> The librarians and their respective educational association - in their quest for SURVIVAL, STATUS, and POWER - have been driven beyond ethical consideration and practices to achieve their ultimate ends; the domination and control of modern educational technology and its funds. (1970, p. 13)

Burlingame's report indicated that 77% of his interviewees identified attitude of personnel as a major drawback of the unified organizational pattern. He concluded that "attitude is the most important factor perceived by staff in determining success of a unified center" (1974, p. 63). Howard agreed that the people involved are the most important single element affecting outcomes (1974), and McPheeters (1980) felt that only when administrators and staff develop a cooperative attitude toward planning for the use of media can maximum effectiveness be achieved.

Usually the media center first becomes involved with production, and when the quantity of material is small, an attempt is made to service the materials. However, Enright (1972) pointed out that often as the collection grows and use increases, the media center is confronted with a conflict of interest between servicing the holdings, and the production of new materials which is normally regarded as their primary purpose. At this point, the need for some kind of organization of the media resources within an institution becomes unavoidable. Even personnel dealing primarily with instructional development report that much of their task description lists library work as the main activity, with another group describing their services as providing media equipment and production (Osterman, 1980).

In cases where a separate organization from the library has been established, experience has not been uniformly satisfactory: the two centers become rivals for

funds; an optimistic assumption that media can be organized more simply than print without "conventional" library procedures often results in a necessity for re-organization; and, separate organizations do not enable the use of both types of material to be maximized. Unnecessary competition and duplication of effort may result. One of Nelson's respondents commented that

> this separation of interests may not be the most efficient, nor the most effective, but it is what the University Administration has approved of up to this point. (Nelson, 1980, p.5)

Among prime consideration in the development of an effective multi-media center is the amount of financial resource available. Maintenance of adequate non-print technology services must be an addition to, not a replacement of, traditional library services. As dollars for education have become less plentiful, the economics of separate establishments have come into question.

Organizational Structure

Many institutions have conducted self-studies (Chico State College, California, 1972; University of North Carolina at Charlotte, 1974; Taylor University, 1980; University of Evansville, 1981; Northern Alabama University, 1982) and recommended organizational changes to integrate learning resources and to coordinate separate operating functions into a unified administrative unit. McPheeters (1980) felt that such an operation fits well with the current drive to economize on resource use in

learning, including teachers' time, materials and facilities. Regardless of the stated rationale for administrative integration, the underlying one is to make more effective use of available resources, with some administrators hoping to raise the level of services (Howard, 1974).

> Closer coordination could result in improved bibliographic access, cooperation in the acquisition and storage of nonprint materials, and improved services. Given the readily apparent benefits, improved coordination should be an attainable goal. (Walter, 1982, p.57)

Whatever the organizational framework, there must not be a feeling of antagonism or rivalry between the media production/service unit and the library. Fullest opportunities must be taken to complement each other and work in close collaboration. "With proper administrative care and input, this cooperation should become a vital part of the overall services " (Osterman, 1980, p.47). Such cooperation can be an important element in implementing instructional innovations and improvements. Some colleges have made either the director of the audiovisual center or the director of library services responsible for both operations, while others have linked the two services under a common head who is neither a librarian nor a media specialist, but, rather a generalist who specializes in the movement of information from a source to a patron. A broadening of attitudes and outlook may gradually begin to transcend departmental boundaries and diminish the

potential for conflict (Howard, 1974). It is not uncommon to link the two activities administratively only through an institutional vice-president (Enright, 1972).

Integration

If the library, however, becomes intimately involved in nonprint media and equipment, thought should be given to a fully coordinated program, for the integration of necessary resources and services into present operations. Integration of library and audiovisual services into one functional unit within today's academic library is advocated by many practitioners in the library field (Ducote, 1972; Taylor, 1972; Wheelbarger, 1973). This development, Akeroyd (1973) points out, insures equal access to all media in order to allow them to be used in close interaction. Students and faculty would have all types of information resources necessary to obtain the most complete and accurate results possible. Comprehensive centers are usually the result of central administrative planning and support (Merren, 1975). Such an amalgamation of media materials would inevitably affect library staffing structure and responsibilities. Stone's warning in 1969 is still valid that there is a lack of sufficient experimentation concerning the kinds of staff needed to manage an optimum program, and plans for administrative organization which will operate effectively when the communications service is seen as a unified entity.

Incorporation of media materials into the library

affects relationships between the library and the institution's media production unit. The Hayward report (1964) emphasized the necessity of a direct working relationship between the units, while the Chico report recommended the coordination of all learning resources, e.g., "Media Center, Library, Computer System, common distribution systems for the resources both on and off the campus" (1972, p. 1) into a functioning integrated system. The feeling was that such integration would provide greater efficiency and effectiveness from the pooling of related needs for hardware and function. There will, of course, continue to be many areas between library and media units which remain ill-defined. This makes close liaison between the two activities even more crucial.

> The precise nature of the relationship within an educational institution is likely to vary according to the nature of the institution, its activities and objectives, and not least, the personalities of its librarian, media service head and administrators. (Enright, 1972, p. 124)

Future Role

"Libraries and librarians have a much larger social role to play in the uses of instructional media then members of the profession have sometimes acknowledged" (Hickey, 1977, p. 47). "We must begin to see libraries, not as book agencies only, but as agencies of communication" (Asheim, 1977, p. 46). The California State College Library Objectives, 1972-1982, as adopted by the Board of Trustees stated that:

> The primary objective of an institutional library

> is to support, in a cost beneficial manner, the academic programs...and to participate actively with students and faculty in the intellectual and cultural activities. Each college must, therefore, develop its library in a manner which will be most responsive to the institution's range of academic needs....
>
> However, the concept of the library primarily as a book-oriented institution will continue to change as language laboratories, audiovisual services, computer-assisted instruction, provision for reproduction of documents and related activities are centered in the facility, with the result of the achievement of the broader concept of the library as communications-oriented, that is, as a comprehensive instructional resources center. (p. 56-57)

But one must also heed the caution that

> "A stereotyped organizational pattern is unlikely to emerge for education generally, and it would be foolhardy to seek to transfer elsewhere a structural arrangement merely because it appears to be successful in a particular educational environment. (Faris, 1969, p. 47)

Conclusion

It was surprising that the great wealth of literature on the subject of library/audiovisual center coordination, cooperation and integration was written in the years from the mid-sixties to the mid-seventies. Despite exhaustive searches of the literature sources, the researcher was able to locate only a few appropriate writings in the eighties. This leads one to question the reasons for this lack. Perhaps the amount of money available to educational institutions in the sixties compared to the amount available in the eighties caused the question to be resolved in a pragmatic manner; colleges have been hit by

inflation and no longer have financial resources to support rival facilities. Institutional self-studies may have pointed the direction in which best access and service could be provided on particular campuses, making theoretical discussion a moot point. Librarians and audiovisualists may have realized that their goals and services are complementary, and have agreed that cooperation was the best policy. Additional possibilities could be theorized, including the one that nobody really cared anymore so there was no reason for discussion.

The College Library Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries, however, felt that interest was not lacking, that many institutions were still struggling to make the appropriate decision, and that it would be useful to have factual information concerning library/audiovisual center relationships. It was felt that the dearth of current literature on the topic did not indicate that the topic was no longer timely. Current information on how print and nonprint materials are handled on college campuses could be useful to those responsible for carrying out the educational mission.

## CHAPTER III

## METHODS AND PROCEDURES

### Overview

The purpose of this study was to collect data from librarians, audiovisual directors and college administrators in order to ascertain whether there was any discernable pattern in the handling of nonprint media at the four-year college level. It was hoped that the resulting information would help administrators examine the organization of multi-media learning materials at other institutions, and to question whether practical policies of cooperation and coordination relevant to their own particular situations had been established. Through an examination of one's campus policies and comparison of them to organizational structures on similar campuses across the country, administrators might find solutions to problems, or confirmation of the efficacy of their chosen policies.

### Sponsoring Agency

The survey was conducted under the sponsorship of the American Library Association, Academic College and Research Libraries (ACRL) College Library Section, Committee on Non-Print Media and the College Library. Since this Committee meets only twice annually and the same members are not always able to attend, the development of a suitable questionnaire was extended over a long period of time. No comparable survey had been found in the educational or library literature although some similar

questionnaires on a smaller, localized scale have since come to light.

A unanimous decision was reached that the questionnaire should be brief enough that answering it could be accomplished in fifteen minutes or less. The committee felt that most administrators, no matter how busy, or how weary of questionnaires, would be willing to spend a short amount of time providing information which was readily available to them. Space was allowed for additional comments.

The first draft was presented to the Committee by its Chair, Mrs. B. Anne Commerton, Director of Libraries, State University of New York, College at Oswego, in January of 1981. From that time until July of 1982, many revisions were suggested by various committee members. Although no one was totally satisfied with the final revisions, the Committee decided to go ahead with the questionnaire, and consider that as the final draft.

Sample

A stratified random sample of four hundred four-year undergraduate institutions was surveyed: the institutions might grant Master's degrees, but it was intended to exclude those institutions with doctoral programs. The size of the college was to fall within the 500-10,000 FTE (full-time equivalent) student range. Colleges with less than 500 FTE were eliminated, as it was felt that their situations would not provide a picture typical of the

majority of the institutions represented. A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education published by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1976) was used to obtain names of colleges within three size ranges: 500-1,000; 1,001-5,000;5,001-10,000. A proportional number from each size grouping was selected in relation to the total number of colleges within each size range. This list, published seven years previously, could not be totally accurate, but it was felt that changes of student population in individual institutions would not be so drastic as to change the size grouping into which most of the colleges were placed. No attempt was made to select colleges geographically, with the result that Alaska, Hawaii, Montana, and Wyoming were not represented on the final lists.

A TRS-80 Model III microcomputer was used to randomly select 104 colleges in the size range of 501-1,000; 240 colleges in the size range of 1,001-5,000, and 56 colleges in the size range of 5,001-10,000, making a total of 400, or 41% of the total number of colleges classified as being either Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I or II, or Liberal Arts Colleges I or II, and falling into the selected size range.

Nature of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed for computer-based data analysis, with the primary format of data collection being multiple choice responses. Basic background

information for each institution was requested as part of the survey, including questions on location (urban, suburban, rural), enrollment size, and financial base, in order that individual responses could be treated anonymously.

Since an investigation of what is occurring at the present time in college library/audiovisual center relationships was the primary purpose of the survey, questions were asked concerning the degree and type of integration of media collections and services with traditional library services; amount and type of access to media for students as well as faculty; staffing of the service areas; and administration of the centers. Availability of production services, physical setup and administrative philosophy were examined (See Appendix A).

Distribution of the Survey

During the Fall of 1982, the survey was pretested by members of the Committee. After incorporation of additional suggestions, the final questionnaire was prepared and mailed out in January 1983, return requested by March 1. The questionnaire was duplicated by mimeograph and consisted of cover instructions, a glossary of terms, and 42 items to be answered on a IBM Form H 45352 (See Appendix A). The Committee's name headed the instruction sheet, and a cover letter by the Chair, Mrs. B. Anne Commerton, listed Committee members. The packet was addressed to the Office of Academic Vice-President of each institution with the

request that it be forwarded to the individual on campus who could best answer the questions. It was felt that such a document arriving from a college administrator would receive higher priority in being answered than if it arrived from "just one more committee."

A total of 396 questionnaires were actually mailed out; no addresses could be located for the other four institutions, leading to the speculation that they had either merged with other institutions, changed names or closed their doors. Enclosed return envelopes were numbered to correspond to the institution's assigned number of the computer printout of random numbers. Although the information itself was to be computed anonymously, it was necessary to identify to which institutions copies of the results should be sent. Because of the lack of a committee budget, the return envelopes were not stamped, but a meager three or four respondents mentioned this. There is always the possibility to be considered that lack of a stamped return envelope may have deterred some potential respondents.

Final Sample

Responses were received from 270 institutions but four arrived after the tabulation of the surveys by the College Computer Center, so the 67% return response represented 266 surveys.

Although the value of a follow-up reminder was appreciated, here, again, budget restrictions were felt.

With 67% return response received, it was decided that the return rate was sufficient for the results of this survey to be reasonably representative of the current pattern in print/nonprint integration.

Hypotheses

The primary purpose of the survey was to gather information concerning the state of print/nonprint integration in four-year colleges in the United States. It was hoped that a result of the survey would be the emergence of a common pattern of development which is taking place on campuses in the treatment of learning materials, and their administration. It was anticipated that survey results would show that:

I. there is in actuality minimal integration of print and nonprint materials at the four-year academic level;

II. integration of staff in the two areas would be minimal;

III. most campuses would have separate AV Centers and libraries with separate directors;

IV. size of the institution would influence organizational pattern;

V. geographical location would not influence amount or lack of integration;

VI. most institutions wishing integrated facilities and/or staff would already have achieved such integration;

VII. individuals with library degrees would be more likely to be the administrator of integrated facilities.

Data Analysis and Techniques

After collating the results of the 266 returned

surveys by means of an IBM 3881 Mark Optical Reader, the *a posteriori* chi-square test for independent variables was applied to determine if the variables of college size and geographical location resulted in any significant difference in degree of integration of print and nonprint resources. Application of the chi square test made it possible to draw inferences from statistically significant data as to what is happening in college libraries across the country. The chi squares were calculated on a TRS 80 Model III microcomputer.

## CHAPTER IV

## RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

### The Sample

A stratified random sample of institutions was selected by size without regard to regional classification. The original sample was comprised of 104 institutions within the 501-1000 FTE (full time equivalent student) range; 240 within the 1001-5000 FTE range, and 56 in the 5001-10,000 FTE range. Of the resulting total of 400 institutions, 396 questionnaires were actually mailed to those originally selected to be in the sample.

TABLE 1

RANDOM SAMPLE FOR MAILING

| College Size* | Number Selected | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| 501 - 1000 | 104 | 26 |
| 1001 - 5000 | 240 | 60 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 56 | 14 |
| Total | 400** | 100 |

*Breakdown by Carnegie Classification
**396 actually mailed

Of the 396 questionnaires actually mailed to the 400 selected colleges a total of 266 responses were received. This constitutes a return of 67.2%. Inasmuch as Item 2 of the questionnaire contained a size classification that was more discriminating than the base data used for sample selection it could not be ascertained whether the sample of returned questionnaires was completely representative. It was, however, divided by FTE categories to allow some

degree of comparision to the original percentages of mailed questionnaires. The results of this subdivision are presented as Table 2.

TABLE 2

RESPONSES

| College Size* | Number Received | % of Total |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 132 | 49.4 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 69 | 25.8 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 33 | 12.4 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 26 | 9.7 |
| Other (outside sample) | 6 | 2.6 |
| Total | 266 | 99.9 |

*Breakdown by Item 2 of questionnaire.

It can be seen by examining Table 2 that proportionately fewer responses were received from the larger sized colleges. This seems to remain true even though part of the "Other" category contains schools larger than the upper limit of 10,000.

Final Sample by Geographic Region

Each respondent had been requested to report in writing the location, by state, of the employing institution. The questionnaires were hand-sorted into five geographic areas, as listed in the U.S. Census publication State and Metropolitan Area Data Book, 1982, "Table C, Area and Population; Regions, Divisions and States" (p. 448). The following groupings were chosen: NORTHEAST AND MIDATLANTIC, including Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New

Jersey, and Pennsylvania; CENTRAL, including Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, North and South Dakota, Nebraska and Kansas; SOUTH, including Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas; MOUNTAIN, including Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada; and PACIFIC, including Washington, Oregon and California.

One can see by examining Table 3 the relative census

TABLE 3

AREA AND POPULATION

| Region | Population (1,000) | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 49,135 | 22 |
| Central | 58,866 | 26 |
| Mountain | 11,373 | 5 |
| Pacific | 31,800 | 14 |
| South | 75,372 | 33 |

population percentages of each region. Given this pattern, the greatest population occurs in the Southern region and least in the Mountain states.

Table 4 is a presentation of the distribution of the sample by the defined census regions. An examination of this table will show that the greatest differences between the distribution of the sample data and the census data are in the range of seven percent. It thus appears that the distribution of the colleges in the sample is roughly in the same proportion as the distribution of the population itself.

TABLE 4

RESPONSES BY REGION

| Region | Number of Responses | Percent Responses |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 64 | 24.1 |
| Central | 98 | 33.1 |
| Mountain | 6 | 2.2 |
| Pacific | 19 | 7.1 |
| South | 89 | 33.5 |
| Total | 266 | 100.0 |

General Survey Results

The first four items on the survey were meant to elicit general institutional information: media services, size of student body, setting, and financial support. This information formed the base from which the initial computer sorts were performed: by region, and by size of institution, and was essential in comparing data and analyzing the effect size and regional placement might have on management and integration of print/nonprint materials.

Unless otherwise noted, all figures in the tables represent percentages of the whole. There are some discrepancies in the total number of answers and the percentages, as not all respondents answered all questions.

The chi-square test for independence was used to determine if there were any significant differences related to size of institution or region of the country in which the institution is located.

Because budgets and, therefore, library holdings, staff and facilities are usually dependent on the size of an institution, Item 2, college size, was selected as the original sort in computing where significant differences at the .05 level occurred, with the second computation by region.

In response to Item 1, 21.6% indicated that their campus had additional components beyond a centralized library, although only 1% had departmental libraries. The most popular combination of services was a centralized library, together with an audiovisual center and a media production unit (8%); 6% supported an audiovisual center (or room) with the library; 2% had all facilities: centralized library, departmental libraries, an audiovisual center and a media production unit; .8% had a centralized library and media production unit, but no audiovisual center.

In order to produce finer size distinctions, Item 2 introduced a fourth size grouping into the original three, with 49% of those responding ranging in size from 500 - 1500 FTE students; 25% having 1501 - 3000; 12% falling within the range of 3001 - 5000; 9% grouping between 5001 - 10,000, and 1% others which should have fallen outside the original sample. These size groupings were used to run the first computer sort on the collected data.

Setting. Responses to Item 3 indicated that within the total sample, college setting was well diversified:

> Item 3. College setting: (A) urban (B) suburban (C) rural.

Table 5 is a presentation of the distribution of the sample with respect to the institution's local setting. Table 5 indicates that 36% of the institutions were located in urban settings, 23% in suburban, and 38% in rural locations. In every size grouping, a suburban setting was least likely to occur, although smallest institutions did not show the range of difference as did other size groupings. 3001 - 5000 FTE institutions appeared most likely to have urban settings while 5001 - 10,000 FTE colleges were likely to have rural settings. It appears

TABLE 5

COLLEGE SETTING

| College Size | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
|---|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 34 | 26 | 37 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 33 | 21 | 44 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 51 | 24 | 24 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 38 | 11 | 50 |
| Total percentages | 36 | 23 | 38 |

from Table 6 that Central and Mountain colleges were predominantly rural. The Pacific area was high in suburban locations with 42%, while urban settings were high in the South with 44%. The Northeast was almost evenly divided among all three types of settings.

TABLE 6

COLLEGE SETTING, BY REGION

| Region | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
|---|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 31 | 34 | 34 |
| Central | 32 | 18 | 46 |
| Mountain | 33 | 16 | 50 |
| Pacific | 26 | 42 | 31 |
| South | 44 | 17 | 34 |

Funding. The source of institutional income was the focus of Item 4 in the survey:

> Item 4. Financial support: (A) private (B) public.

Private funds support 70% of responding colleges, as shown in Table 7. 92% of the smallest colleges are privately funded, while only 19% of the 5001-10,000 FTE colleges are supported by private funds. The 3001 - 5000 FTE student

TABLE 7

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

| College Size | Private | Public |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 92 | 7 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 59 | 40 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 51 | 48 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 19 | 76 |
| Total percentages | 70 | 28 |

body is apparently the point at which public funds begin to be the predominate source of financial responsibility. A steady progression from private to public funding appears

from the smallest to the largest institutions.

Regional distribution of funding patterns are shown in Table 8. Central states have the highest percentage (81%) of institutions supported by private funds, while the Mountain states with 33% report the lowest. Pacific and Northeastern regions are close in reporting a predominance of private funding, with a spread of less than seven percentage points separating them from the Central states.

TABLE 8

FINANCIAL SUPPORT, BY REGION

| Region | Private | Public |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 75 | 25 |
| Central | 81 | 18 |
| Mountain | 33 | 66 |
| Pacific | 78 | 15 |
| South | 57 | 40 |

No significant differences were apparent by either size or region when responses to the above items were subjected to the chi-square test.

The questionnaire was directed to the Academic Vice President, rather than to the Director of Library Services, because it was felt that it might be revealing to see to whom the survey was forwarded for completion. Item 5 collated that information. The fact that a library group was conducting the survey might have influenced the choice, as would lack of an appropriate audiovisual director. In any case, 62% of the responses were from library directors, 10% from directors of AV centers, 5% from Coordinators of

the two units and 19% from others, including college administrators, or middle-management library and media personnel.

Library book holdings. Since library acquisitions are dependent upon budget, the size of holdings often reflects the size of the institution:

> Item 6. College holdings. Options: (A) under 50,000 (B) 50,000 - 150,000 (C) 150,000 - 225,000 (D) over 225,000.

With the question of library holdings, it was anticipated that the smaller schools would be the ones with the smallest collections, but only 2% of the respondents in that category indicated their book holdings to be under 50,000 volumes, while 3% in the 3001-5000 range so indicated. Most of the larger schools (88%) own over 225,000 library volumes, as indicated in Table 9. Responses

TABLE 9

NUMBER OF VOLUMES IN LIBRARY

| College Size | Under 50,000 | 50,000-150,000 | 150,000-225,000 | Over 225,000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 2 | 70 | 17 | 9 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 1 | 39 | 34 | 24 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 3 | 21 | 39 | 36 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 88 |
| Total percent | 2 | 48 | 23 | 24 |

indicated that the majority of library collections among respondents fall within the lower size ranges.

In applying the chi-square test for independence, responses to Option A in the Holdings category were

eliminated, as the observed frequency was too small to allow computation. The following table shows the expectation under the hypothesis of no difference.

TABLE 10

MATRIX OF OBSERVED/EXPECTED FREQUENCIES - ITEM 6

| College Size | Options: B | C | D |
|---|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 93/64.2 | 23/31.9 | 13/32.9 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 27/33.9 | 24/16.8 | 17/17.3 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 7/15.9 | 13/ 7.9 | 12/ 8.2 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 0/12.9 | 3/ 6.4 | 23/ 6.6 |

Observed frequencies indicate that smallest colleges hold smaller collections than might be expected, while largest colleges hold larger collections than might be expected. Middle-range institutions appear more likely to hold collections of expected size ranges.

As might be expected, applying the chi-square test indicated that size of institution is a significant factor in size of library book holdings ($\chi^2$=89.74, p<.001, df=6). It would appear that there is a regional variation in numbers of library holdings, with more institutions in the Pacific region holding both larger and smaller collections than colleges in the other regions. The remaining regions fall within a fairly close range in the same category, with the greatest variations falling with the middle ranges of holdings. Applying the chi-square test for independence, however, indicated that the above differences were not

TABLE 11

NUMBER OF VOLUMES IN LIBRARY, BY REGION

| Region | Under 50,000 | 50,000-150,000 | 150,000-225,000 | Over 225,000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 4 | 43 | 31 | 20 |
| Central | 0 | 59 | 17 | 23 |
| Mountain | 0 | 50 | 33 | 16 |
| Pacific | 5 | 15 | 26 | 52 |
| South | 2 | 48 | 23 | 23 |

great enough to show regional location to be a significant factor when it came to library holdings.

Audiovisual holdings. Numbers of audiovisual materials were requested by title, rather than piece, in order to more nearly equate them with book holdings:

> Item 7. Approximate number of audiovisual titles: (A) under 500 (B) 500 - 1500 (C) 1500 - 3000 (D) over 3000.

The range of holdings of audiovisual titles appears to be smaller than that of library holdings. Although it remains true that the largest institutions have the largest collections of audiovisual materials, the percentage spread is not as great as with book holdings.

Of the respondents, 33% indicated that their audiovisual holdings fall into the largest size category, compared to the 24% with book collections in the largest size range. On the other end of the scale, 19% reported audiovisual collections in the smallest size range, with 2% reporting book collections in the smallest holdings range.

TABLE 12

APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF AUDIOVISUAL TITLES

| College Size | Under 500 | 500-1500 | 1500-3000 | Over 3000 | Omit |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 27 | 23 | 19 | 25 | 3 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 15 | 23 | 18 | 39 | 2 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 9 | 24 | 30 | 33 | 3 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 4 | 12 | 20 | 65 | 0 |
| Total percentages | 19 | 22 | 20 | 33 | 3 |

Application of the chi-square test under the hypothesis of no difference is shown in Table 13. It

TABLE 13

MATRIX OF OBSERVED/EXPECTED FREQUENCIES - ITEM 7

| AV Hold. | 500-1500 | 1501-3000 | 3001-5000 | 5001-10,000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | 36/25.7 | 11/13.6 | 3/ 6.5 | 1/5.3 |
| B | 31/29.2 | 16/15.4 | 8/ 7.4 | 3/6 |
| C | 26/27.2 | 13/14.4 | 10/ 6.9 | 5/5.6 |
| D | 34/44.9 | 27/23.7 | 11/11.3 | 17/9.2 |

appears that smallest institutions have, on the whole, less audiovisual material than might be expected, while the largest institutions have more than might be expected. Size of institution is a significant factor in the number of audiovisual holdings, ($\chi^2$=18.84, $p<.05$, df=9).

The Pacific region institutions report smaller numbers of audiovisual titles than the other regions. However, the percentage of respondents from that region which omitted that item was four times greater than in any other region.

TABLE 14

NUMBER OF AUDIOVISUAL TITLES, BY REGION

| Region | Under 500 | 500-1500 | 1500-3000 | Over 3000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 20 | 23 | 18 | 34 |
| Central | 21 | 20 | 19 | 38 |
| Mountain | 16 | 0 | 16 | 66 |
| Pacific | 31 | 5 | 25 | 21 |
| South | 14 | 28 | 22 | 29 |

By region, spread for holdings under 500 is 17 percentage points, while by size, the spread between largest institutions and smallest institutions reporting under 500 titles is 23 percentage points. Over 3000 title holdings yields a 40 percentage point spread by size and a 44 percentage point spread by region. However, application of the chi-square test failed to show that these differences among regions were significant.

Media Production

Item 8 through Item 13 dealt with media production facilities provided by responding institutions.

No media production unit. Item 8 was the basic question upon which Item 9 through Item 13 depended.

> Item 8. If there is no media production unit, skip numbers 9 through 13, and mark (E).

Of those replying to Item 8, 94 (36%) indicated no production unit; 41% of the smallest colleges indicated no production unit, as compared to 2?% of the largest schools.

TABLE 15

NO PRODUCTION UNIT

| College Size | Number | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 55 | 41 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 25 | 36 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 4 | 12 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 6 | 23 |
| Total | 94* | 35 |

*Some respondents to this Item (as well as additional items considered later) fell outside the given size ranges, but were included in the number of total respondents.

The 3001-5000 FTE colleges appear to break the regular percentage progression in the responses to this item. Within that size grouping, it would seem that the greatest number of responding institutions maintain a production unit.

In comparing Table 15 and Table 16, it appears that size of the institution is more of a factor in the lack or

TABLE 16

NO PRODUCTION UNIT, BY REGION

| Region | Number | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 25 | 39 |
| Central | 29 | 32 |
| Mountain | 1 | 16 |
| Pacific | 7 | 36 |
| South | 32 | 35 |

presence of a media production unit than is the regional location. With the exception of the Mountain area, all regions report similar percentages in the absence of such a

unit.

Media production appears to be available in more than half of the responding institutions, with fairly even distribution of such services across the country, except in the Mountain States which provide this service half as frequently as other regions. Application of the chi-square test, however, showed no significant difference resulting from size of institution or region.

Media production unit. Where there is a media production unit, the greatest number of these units have other responsibilities in addition to production:

> Item 9. The media production unit is responsible only for production.

Of the respondents, 79% indicated that the media production unit on their campus assumes responsibility for more than media production. The largest size institutions would

TABLE 17

MEDIA PRODUCTION ONLY

| College Size | Response | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | YES | | NO | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 500 - 1500 | 10 | 17.5 | 47 | 82.5 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 5 | 13.5 | 32 | 86.5 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 7 | 25.9 | 20 | 74.1 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 7 | 38.9 | 11 | 61.1 |
| Totals | 29 | 23.9 | 111 | 76.1 |

appear to be most likely to support media production units which have only production as their responsibility, reporting that to be the case in 38.9% of the institutions

with such a unit. Even in largest institutions, however, it is the pattern for media production units to have other responsibilities in addition to production.

Regional distribution seemed to indicate a smaller variation in Media Production Unit responsibilities than did college size. The Central region colleges, followed

TABLE 18

MEDIA PRODUCTION ONLY, BY REGION

| Region | Response | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | YES | | NO | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Northeast | 6 | 17.6 | 28 | 82.4 |
| Central | 15 | 30 | 35 | 70 |
| Mountain | 1 | 25 | 3 | 75 |
| Pacific | 1 | 10 | 9 | 90 |
| South | 6 | 14.3 | 36 | 85.7 |

closely by Mountain colleges, would seem to be most likely to support media production units which have responsibility for nothing more than media production. Pacific, Southern and Northeastern institutions support units which do only production in less than 18% of the institutions with such a unit. Application of the chi-square test showed no significant difference resulting from size of institution or regional location.

Administration of AV production unit. As far as administration of the production unit, 79% of those institutions maintaining such units, have the same director as the unit which houses and distributes media:

Item 11. The media production unit is administered by the same director as the unit which houses and distributes media software: (A) YES (B) NO.

Smallest institutions are more likely to have the same director for the two units than are any other size

TABLE 19

ONE DIRECTOR

| College Size | Response | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | YES | | NO | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 500 - 1500 | 53 | 93 | 4 | 7 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 25 | 68 | 12 | 32 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 20 | 77 | 6 | 23 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 15 | 79 | 4 | 21 |
| Totals | 114 | 79 | 26 | 21 |

institutions. Least likely to have one director over media production and media distribution are the 1501-3000 FTE colleges, as indicated in Table 19. A presentation of observed/expected responses under the hypothesis of no difference is shown as Table 20. Size is a significant

TABLE 20

MATRIX OF OBSERVED/EXPECTED FREQUENCIES - ITEM 11

| OPTIONS | 500-1500 | 1501-3000 | 3001-5000 | 5001-10,000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 53/46.3 | 25/30.1 | 20/21.1 | 15/15.4 |
| NO | 4/10.7 | 12/ 6.9 | 6/ 4.9 | 4/ 3.6 |

factor in the provision and administration of media production units in four-year colleges. Those institutions combining media production and media distribution under a

single director show an even progression from the largest down to the second smallest grouping, at which point the percentage doubles, ($\chi^2$=8.21, p<.05, df=3).

In Table 21, one can see a fairly consistent pattern of dual responsibility for one director in the South,

TABLE 21

ONE DIRECTOR, BY REGION

| Region | Response | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | YES | | NO | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Northeast | 30 | 88 | 4 | 12 |
| Central | 40 | 80 | 10 | 20 |
| Mountain | 2 | 50 | 2 | 50 |
| Pacific | 7 | 70 | 3 | 30 |
| South | 35 | 83 | 7 | 17 |

Northeast and Central colleges. Mountain and Pacific colleges are more closely allied percentage-wise in their choice of administrative pattern, but still have one director over the production and media distribution units in at least half of the institutions responding. Application of the chi-square test indicated, however, that these apparent differences among regions failed to be significant.

Physical facilities under a single director. Administration of facilities may tend to dictate the physical location:

> Item 13. If 11 is YES (one Director over production and distibution units), both areas are located in the same building.

In those 114 institutions where both production and media

distribution units were administered by the same director, 84% have both areas located in the same building, as compared to the 16% where the units are physically separated.

Smallest colleges appear most likely to have media production and distribution in one building, but all other size colleges are likely to locate the two units in one building in 79% or more of the cases. These results are presented as Table 22.

TABLE 22

PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION IN ONE BUILDING

| College Size | Response | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | YES | | NO | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 500 - 1500 | 43 | 93.5 | 3 | 6.5 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 19 | 82.6 | 4 | 17.4 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 17 | 81 | 4 | 19 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 11 | 79 | 3 | 21 |
| Totals | 91* | 84 | 14 | 16 |

*1 respondent fell outside size categories

Table 23 indicates that in all regions, institutions

TABLE 23

PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION IN ONE BUILDING, BY REGION

| Region | Response | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | YES | | NO | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Northeast | 24 | 83 | 5 | 17 |
| Central | 30 | 88 | 4 | 12 |
| Mountain | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Pacific | 5 | 71 | 2 | 29 |
| South | 30 | 91 | 3 | 9 |

have the same inclination to provide media production and distribution services in the same building. The Pacific institutions, alone, indicate such a choice in less than 80% of the cases.

Application of the chi-square test indicated that there are no significant differences caused by institutional size or regional location.

Equipment

Questionnaire Items 14, 15, and 16 dealt with the handling of audiovisual equipment within each institution.

Audiovisual equipment distribution. Classroom audiovisual equipment is distributed through the AV Center in 88% of the largest colleges, while 50% of the smallest colleges reported classroom equipment distribution through an AV Center:

> Item 14. Audiovisual equipment distribution for classroom use is done through (A) the Library (B) the AV Center (C) the production unit (if separate from A & B).

TABLE 24

AUDIOVISUAL CLASSROOM EQUIPMENT DISTRIBUTION

| College Size | Library | AV Center | Prod. Unit |
|---|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 38 | 50 | 0 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 27 | 56 | 7 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 12 | 75 | 3 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 0 | 88 | 0 |
| Total percentages | 28 | 58 | 3 |

As indicated in Table 24, size of college appears to determine the method of distribution of audiovisual

equipment for classroom use. Applying the chi-square test for independence results in the following table.

TABLE 25

MATRIX OF OBSERVED/EXPECTED FREQUENCIES - ITEM 14

| OPTIONS | 500-1500 | 1501-3000 | 3001-5000 | 5001-10,000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Library | 51/38.1 | 19/18.9 | 4/ 9.5 | 0/ 7.5 |
| AV Center | 66/78.9 | 39/39.1 | 25/19.5 | 23/15.5 |
| Prod.Unit | 1/3.5 | 5/ 1.9 | 1/ 0.9 | 0/ 0.7 |

Option C (production unit) was dropped when the chi-square test of significance was applied, as the response to this item was too small to calculate. Size is a significant factor in determining which campus agency handles loan of classroom audiovisual equipment. None of the largest colleges handle such loan through either the library or the production unit, while the library is an alternate choice in many of the smaller colleges, ($\chi^2$ = 19.48, $p<.001$, df=3).

TABLE 26

AUDIOVISUAL CLASSROOM EQUIPMENT DISTRIBUTION, BY REGION

| Region | Library | AV Center | Prod. Unit |
|---|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 23 | 64 | 3 |
| Central | 27 | 59 | 2 |
| Mountain | 66 | 33 | 0 |
| Pacific | 21 | 73 | 0 |
| South | 31 | 52 | 4 |

With the exception of institutions in the Mountain region, it appears that classroom audiovisual equipment is

usually distributed through an audiovisual center. No significant difference appeared among regions when the chi-square test of independence was applied.

Individual equipment use. If provision were made for individual use of equipment by students and faculty, it would seem that such provision would be made through the same units which provided for classroom equipment distribution:

> Item 15. Audiovisual equipment loan for individual use is done through: (A) the Library (B) the AV Center (C) the production unit (D) there is no loan for individual use.

Loan of equipment for individual use is reported by 79% of the respondents. The AV center is the major agency for

TABLE 27

INDIVIDUAL USE AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT LOAN

| College Size | Library | AV Center | Prod. Unit | No Loan |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 34 | 45 | 0 | 15 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 26 | 50 | 5 | 11 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 12 | 63 | 3 | 21 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 3 | 84 | 0 | 7 |
| Total percentages | 25 | 52 | 2 | 14 |

loaning audiovisual equipment in all sizes of institutions responding. As indicated in Table 28, size does cause a difference in how such loan is handled. Audiovisual equipment loan for individual use is affected by

institution size. Larger colleges appear to handle more

TABLE 28

MATRIX OF OBSERVED/EXPECTED FREQUENCIES - ITEM 15

| OPTIONS | 500-1500 | 1501-3000 | 3001-5000 | 5001-10,000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Library | 45/35.1 | 18/17 | 4/ 8.9 | 1/ 7 |
| AV Center | 60/71.3 | 35/34.5 | 21/18.1 | 22/14.1 |
| Prod.Unit | 1/ | 4/ | 1/ | 0/ |
| None | 21/19.6 | 8/ 9.5 | 7/ 5 | 2/ 3.9 |

distribution (individual and classroom) through the AV center than through any other campus agency. Option C (production unit) was omitted in calculating the chi-square test, as the number of responses was too small. Although the AV center is the preferred distribution outlet for individual use of equipment, it is not chosen by smallest institutions as often as might be expected ($\chi^2$ =15.88, $p<.02$, df=6).

TABLE 29

INDIVIDUAL USE AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT LOAN, BY REGION

| Region | Library | AV Center | Prod. Unit | No Loan |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 28 | 56 | 3 | 9 |
| Central | 25 | 55 | 1 | 13 |
| Mountain | 66 | 33 | 0 | 0 |
| Pacific | 10 | 57 | 0 | 26 |
| South | 25 | 47 | 4 | 17 |

By region, the results show some variation. One quarter of the Pacific colleges report no loan to individuals, while all institutions responding from the Mountain states loan to individuals. In all regions, as in

all size colleges, the AV Center most often has responsibility for loaning equipment to individals, as well as for classroom use (Table 24 and Table 26). Application of the chi-square test of independence did not reveal any significant difference caused by regional location.

Equipment maintenance. For use of audiovisual materials, it is essential to provide sufficient machines in good condition to serve the needs of users. Methods of handling the maintenance and repair of these machines was the information sought through the following item:

> Item 16. Most audiovisual equipment repair is handled by technicians on (A) the Library staff (B) AV Center staff (C) production staff (D) commercial companies.

Maintenance of the audiovisual equipment is performed by AV Center staff in 43% of the institutions, while the same percentage pay for such services from commercial companies. Outside firms are employed for repair in 58% of

TABLE 30

AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT REPAIR

| College Size | Library Staff | AV Center Staff | Prod. Unit | Commercial |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 5 | 32 | 0 | 58 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 4 | 47 | 13 | 31 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 6 | 69 | 0 | 24 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 3 | 57 | 3 | 26 |
| Total percentages | 5 | 43 | 4 | 43 |

the smallest colleges, while almost the same percentage (57%) of the largest schools maintain their own audiovisual

repair staff. Application of the chi-square test for significance resulted in the following table of expectation under the hypothesis of no difference.

TABLE 31

MATRIX OF OBSERVED/EXPECTED FREQUENCIES - ITEM 16A

| OPTIONS | 500-1500 | 1501-3000 | 3001-5000 | 5001-10,000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Library* | 7/ 6.6 | 3/ 3.5 | 2/ 1.7 | 1/ 1.2 |
| AV Center | 43/57.9 | 33/30.3 | 23/14.9 | 15/10.9 |
| Prod.Unit* | 1/ 5.6 | 9/ 2.9 | 0/ 1.4 | 1/ 1 |
| Commercial | 77/57.9 | 22/30.3 | 8/14.9 | 7/10.9 |

*Options A (Library staff) and C (production unit) were omitted in the calculation of chi-square, as their number of responses was too small.

Using Options B (AV Center staff) and D (commercial companies) as the base for calculation, the following observed and expected responses resulted. In every case,

TABLE 32

MATRIX OF OBSERVED/EXPECTED FREQUENCIES - ITEM 16B

| OPTIONS | 500-1500 | 1501-3000 | 3001-5000 | 5001-10,000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AV Center | 43/60 | 33/27.5 | 23/15.5 | 15/11 |
| Commercial | 77/60 | 22/27.5 | 8/15.5 | 7/11 |

more equipment repair was performed by audiovisual center staff than might be expected. Use of commercial repair companies is much more heavily utilized by smaller institutions.

The way in which equipment repair is handled is significantly affected by institution size; 42% of the total number of respondents have audiovisual equipment

repaired by their own audiovisual center staff, while the same percentage pay for such services from commercial companies. It is size of college which determines which way such repair will be handled, ($X^2$=19.44, p<.001, df=3).

Some pattern variations appear in regional distribution. The Northeastern and Central colleges indicated an equal choice between AV center staff and commercial services. Mountain colleges more heavily utilize commercial services and Pacific colleges indicated that a high percentage of equipment repair is performed by staff in their own AV Center. Application of the chi-square test,

TABLE 33

AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT REPAIR, BY REGION

| Region | Library Staff | AV Center Staff | Prod. Unit | Commercial |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 3 | 46 | 3 | 42 |
| Central | 7 | 43 | 3 | 43 |
| Mountain | 0 | 33 | 0 | 66 |
| Pacific | 5 | 57 | 5 | 26 |
| South | 4 | 38 | 7 | 46 |

however, indicated that such regional variations were not of significant difference.

Staff

Responses to questions concerning staff indicated that size of institution makes a difference in how closely print and nonprint specialists work together:

> Item 17. Staff dealing with print and nonprint materials work closely together as one unit.

Slightly more than half (57%) of the respondents indicated

in the affirmative to Item 17, that staff dealing with print and nonprint materials do work closely together as one unit. Application of the chi-square test indicated that

TABLE 34

PRINT AND NONPRINT STAFF WORK CLOSELY TOGETHER

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 65 | 33 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 59 | 39 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 36 | 63 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 50 | 46 |
| Total percentages | 57 | 40 |

the apparent differences caused by size of institution are significant. In each case, the smaller FTE colleges are

TABLE 35

MATRIX OF OBSERVED/EXPECTED FREQUENCIES - ITEM 17

| OPTIONS | 500-1500 | 1501-3000 | 3001-5000 | 5001-10,000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 86/77.2 | 41/40.4 | 12/19.6 | 13/14.8 |
| NO | 44/52.8 | 27/27.6 | 21/13.4 | 12/10.2 |

more likely to work closely together, as might be expected, while the opposite is true in the two larger groupings. Smaller institutions rank significantly higher in having print and nonprint staff specialists work closely together, ($\chi^2 = 8.83$, $p < .05$, $df = 3$).

When response by region was tabulated, the Southern institutions appeared to be in exact agreement with percentage totals evidenced throughout all colleges by size. With the exception of the Mountain respondents,

regional variations appeared slight. Most colleges,

TABLE 36

PRINT AND NONPRINT STAFF WORK CLOSELY TOGETHER, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 54 | 45 |
| Central | 59 | 38 |
| Mountain | 100 | 0 |
| Pacific | 52 | 42 |
| South | 57 | 40 |

regardless of size or region, have staff dealing with print and nonprint materials working closely together, and no significant difference caused by location was apparent when the chi-square test was applied.

Item 18 was designed to elicit more information on staff coordination within responding institutions.

> Item 18. An integrated staff works as a resource team with faculty in instructional development and/or materials selection.

There appears to be a difference from staff working closely

TABLE 37

INTEGRATED STAFF

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 50 | 47 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 47 | 49 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 45 | 54 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 38 | 50 |
| Total percentages | 48 | 48 |

as one unit to the next higher level of coordination where an integrated staff works as one resource team in

instructional development and/or materials selection. While 57% of print/nonprint personnel are reported as working closely together (Table 34), only 48% are reported as working as one resource team in instructional development or selection of materials.

Although total percentages are evenly divided on the question of integrated staff, it appears that the smaller schools are more likely to have integrated staff than the largest size colleges. In distribution by region, the Northeast and the Southern colleges are almost reversed in response pattern.

TABLE 38

INTEGRATED STAFF, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 39 | 57 |
| Central | 46 | 50 |
| Mountain | 50 | 50 |
| Pacific | 52 | 42 |
| South | 55 | 41 |

The same trend appears when one looks at responses to Item 19, dealing with the question of integrated staff meetings, shown in Table 39 and Table 40.

> Item 19. Staff meetings include media staff and library staff: (A) YES (B) NO.

The smaller the college, the more likely that media and

TABLE 39

STAFF MEETINGS

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 54 | 42 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 49 | 47 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 36 | 63 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 46 | 50 |
| Total percentages | 49 | 47 |

print staff meet together. Colleges in the 3001 - 5000 FTE size grouping are least likely to have joint media/print staff meetings.

TABLE 40

STAFF MEETINGS, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 37 | 59 |
| Central | 61 | 37 |
| Mountain | 83 | 16 |
| Pacific | 36 | 57 |
| South | 47 | 48 |

Wide variations appear among geographic areas. Southern institutions maintain an even distribution, while Mountain colleges report 83% joint meetings. The Northeastern and Pacific institutions are least likely to hold such joint staff meetings.

AV center staff and media production unit staff are not always the same, so Item 20 was designed to elicit

information on the cooperation and coordination between library staff and media production staff.

Item 20. There is appreciable coordination between library and media production staff.

Close coordination between library and media production staff is reported by 46%, with the same trend evident as in Table 34. Closest coordination is evidenced in smallest institutions, progressing to least coordination in the largest, with the 3001 - 5000 FTE institutons evidencing a break in progression, as in Table 39.

TABLE 41

COORDINATION BETWEEN LIBRARY AND MEDIA PRODUCTION STAFF

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 51 | 32 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 46 | 42 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 33 | 66 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 38 | 46 |
| Total percentages | 46 | 40 |

By region, Southern colleges conform most closely with percentage totals evidenced by college size. Variations by

TABLE 42

COORDINATION BETWEEN LIBRARY AND MEDIA PRODUCTION STAFF, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 43 | 43 |
| Central | 51 | 34 |
| Mountain | 50 | 50 |
| Pacific | 36 | 42 |
| South | 46 | 43 |

regional setting appear to be similar to the range of variations evidenced by size of colleges. In application of the chi-square test, no significant differences were indicated by size of institution or by region for responses to Items 18 through 20, represented by Tables 37 through 42.

Item 21 takes the idea of integration further by questioning the comparability of titles and salaries of media production staff and personnel dealing with print materials. Table 43 is an analysis of the responses

> Item 21. There is differentiation between media production staff and library staff in titles, status and/or pay.

concerning the comparability of titles and salaries. Smallest colleges indicate greater equality in titles, status and/or pay than any other size grouping. Fifty-four

TABLE 43

DIFFERENTIATION IN TITLES, STATUS AND/OR PAY

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 25 | 54 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 46 | 40 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 69 | 30 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 69 | 15 |
| Total percentages | 41 | 43 |

percent of that group report no difference exists, with 40%, 30% and 15% reported by colleges in the other size ranges. Although percentages appear similar when responses are totaled, there is a wide spread between the smallest

and the largest size institutions, and application of the chi-square test (Table 44) indicated a degree of difference related to size.

TABLE 44

MATRIX OF OBSERVED/EXPECTED FREQUENCIES - ITEM 21

| OPTIONS | 500-1500 | 1501-3000 | 3001-5000 | 5001-10,000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 33/46.8 | 32/26.7 | 23/14.7 | 10/ 9.8 |
| NO | 72/58.2 | 28/33.3 | 10/18.3 | 12/12.2 |

In the largest institutions, actual responses are very close to expected responses, but the same pattern is not seen with the remaining three size groups. Size is a significant factor in determining distinctions between media production and library staffs. The smallest colleges are less likely to make such distinctions than the larger, ($\chi^2$=15.79, p<.01, df=3).

Distribution of responses by region did not show the wide variation of responses as did college size.

TABLE 45

DIFFERENTIATION IN TITLES, STATUS AND/OR PAY, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 50 | 32 |
| Central | 37 | 48 |
| Mountain | 50 | 50 |
| Pacific | 42 | 36 |
| South | 38 | 46 |

Application of the chi-square test showed no significant difference caused by regional location.

As far as staff mergers, there is either little current interest, or the interest is not at the level which can accomplish it. Overall, 12% report considering such a

Item 22. A staff merger is being considered: (A) YES (B) NO.

merger. Size of institution does not appear to make a difference in such deliberations. The 12% reporting such

TABLE 46

A STAFF MERGER IS BEING CONSIDERED

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 11 | 59 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 13 | 65 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 18 | 75 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 15 | 73 |
| Total percentages | 12 | 64 |

consideration ranges from a low of 7% in the South to a high of 31% in the Pacific states. By region, as by

TABLE 47

A STAFF MERGER IS BEING CONSIDERED, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 14 | 67 |
| Central | 13 | 55 |
| Mountain | 0 | 83 |
| Pacific | 31 | 52 |
| South | 7 | 73 |

size of college, the greatest majority responded in the negative concerning the consideration of a staff merger.

Application of the chi-square test showed no significant difference caused by either size or regional

location in rejecting current consideration of a merger.

Physical Building

When it came to consideration of the physical building, size of institution was shown to cause a significant difference in only one item:

> Item 23. The Library and the AV Center are located in the same building: (A) YES (B) NO.

Responses indicated that 54% of the institutions house the

TABLE 48

LIBRARY AND AV CENTER LOCATED IN SAME BUILDING

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 62 | 33 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 50 | 43 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 33 | 66 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 57 | 38 |
| Total percentages | 54 | 40 |

library and AV center in the same building. Smallest size institutions, with 62%, and largest institutions, with 57%,

TABLE 49

MATRIX OF OBSERVED/EXPECTED FREQUENCIES - ITEM 23

| OPTIONS | 500-1500 | 1501-3000 | 3001-5000 | 5001-10,000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 82/72.4 | 35/37.3 | 11/19 | 15/14.4 |
| NO | 44/53.6 | 30/27.7 | 22/14 | 10/10.6 |

show a small spread of five percentage points between them. It appears that the 3001 - 5000 FTE colleges are most different in the response pattern.

As in item 21, the largest institutions respond in a

frequency almost exactly as would be expected. Next most predictable was the 1501-3000 FTE size group. The smallest colleges are much more likely to have Library and AV Center in one building, while the 3001-5000 FTE group is least likely. Size causes a significant difference in whether the Library and the AV Center are located in the same building, ($X^2$=9.81, p<.05, df=3).

TABLE 50

LIBRARY AND AV CENTER LOCATED IN SAME BUILDING, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 53 | 43 |
| Central | 62 | 34 |
| Mountain | 83 | 16 |
| Pacific | 42 | 52 |
| South | 49 | 43 |

The Mountain colleges seem to show a wide variation from other regional responses. The 83% indication that both services are located in the same building is much greater than in any other region, but total numbers of responding institutions was less than for other regions. Application of the chi-square test resulted in no significant differences caused by regional location.

Table 51 is a presentation of the responses of the 40% who answered NO to Item 23 of the questionnaire, shown in Table 48:

> Item 24. If 23 is NO, most types of media are serviced in one building: (A) YES (B) NO.

Even where the Library and AV Center are not located in the

same building, the decision has been made by 66% of the respondents to service most types of media in one building.

TABLE 51

MOST TYPES OF MEDIA SERVICED IN ONE BUILDING

| College Size | Response | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | YES | | NO | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 500 - 1500 | 39 | 80 | 10 | 20 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 26 | 79 | 7 | 21 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 13 | 59 | 9 | 41 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 19 | 45 | 23 | 55 |
| Totals | 84 | 66 | 33 | 34 |

Smallest colleges are most likely to consolidate most media,progressing down to largest institutions which are least likely to do so.

Using region as the base, variations show a somewhat different pattern, caused to some degree by the number of

TABLE 52

MOST TYPES OF MEDIA SERVICED IN ONE BUILDING, BY REGION

| Region | Response | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | YES | | NO | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Northeast | 20 | 71 | 8 | 29 |
| Central | 23 | 66 | 12 | 34 |
| Mountain | 1 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Pacific | 8 | 80 | 2 | 20 |
| South | 32 | 74 | 11 | 26 |

respondents within each region. However, institutions in all regions still choose to service most types of media in one building by over two-thirds of the respondents.

When media is housed in the library, only 31% disperse it throughout the building for subject access, rather than housing it in a separate area by format:

> Item 25. Media is dispersed throughout the library, rather than housed in a separate area of the building.

Smallest libraries appear to be most likely to disperse media thoughout the library, with the 500 - 1500 and 1501 - 3000 FTE colleges responding most frequently in the

TABLE 53

MEDIA DISPERSED THROUGH THE LIBRARY

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 37 | 58 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 30 | 63 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 18 | 81 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 19 | 80 |
| Total percentages | 31 | 65 |

affirmative. The two largest groupings appear almost half as likely to disperse media as are the two smaller groups.

TABLE 54

MEDIA DISPERSED THROUGH THE LIBRARY, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 28 | 67 |
| Central | 31 | 67 |
| Mountain | 50 | 50 |
| Pacific | 15 | 78 |
| South | 34 | 59 |

Mountain colleges seem most likely to disperse media throughout the library, while Pacific colleges appear most

likely to consolidate media by format. The other regions cluster together in responses, but conform in their acceptance of media consolidation.

Loan Policies

Noting the difference in housing of print and nonprint materials, it is not surprising to note that the loan periods also differ. Only 29% use the same loan period,

> Item 26. The same loan policies are applied to most print and nonprint materials.

with largest schools more often responding in the affirmative. A difference caused by size appears discernible between the two smaller size groupings compared to the two larger size groupings.

TABLE 55

THE SAME LOAN POLICIES

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 34 | 62 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 33 | 62 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 18 | 81 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 11 | 88 |
| Total percentages | 29 | 67 |

Regional responses show the same pattern of negative responses. Pacific colleges appear most likely to have different policies for print materials than for audiovisual materials. Central and Mountain colleges appear most likely to use the same loan policies for all types of materials,

TABLE 56

THE SAME LOAN POLICIES, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 26 | 70 |
| Central | 34 | 65 |
| Mountain | 33 | 66 |
| Pacific | 15 | 78 |
| South | 29 | 65 |

but percentage spreads are rather small, except in comparison with Pacific region colleges.

Despite what seems to be apparent differences, none of the responses for Items 24 through 26, represented by Tables 51 through 56, showed any significant differences by either size or region when the chi-square test of independence was applied.

Bibliographic Access

Bibliographic access through an interfiled union catalog is, perhaps, one of the easiest ways to unify a collection which is split because of space, personnel or budget. 54% of survey respondents show a commitment to such unified access, while 43% do not provide such access.

> Item 27. Bibliographic access is provided through an interfiled union catalog which includes audiovisual materials as well as printed materials.

Size of the institution does not seem to make a difference in whether or not an interfiled union catalog of all materials is maintained. Comparing Table 57 with Table

48 (library and AV center located in one building), one notes that the same total percentage of institutions

TABLE 57

UNION CATALOG OF AUDIOVISUAL AND PRINTED MATERIALS

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 50 | 47 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 60 | 37 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 54 | 45 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 57 | 42 |
| Total percentages | 54 | 43 |

reporting the Library and AV Center in one building report a union catalog. However, the response breakdowns by size differ.

The Mountain states appear to rank a union catalog as high priority, with 66% of the responses indicating that such a catalog is provided; Southern institutions provide such a catalog 62% of the time, with Central and Northeastern libraries trailing behind with 51% affirmative. Pacific institutions indicate almost the exact reverse of the South, replying 31% affirmative and 63% negative.

TABLE 58

UNION CATALOG OF AUDIOVISUAL AND PRINT MATERIALS, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 51 | 46 |
| Central | 51 | 47 |
| Mountain | 66 | 33 |
| Pacific | 31 | 63 |
| South | 62 | 34 |

Comparing Table 58 with Table 50, one finds a difference within regional responses. It appears that all institutions locating the library and AV Center in one building do not provide a union catalog. Mountain and Southern institutions appear committed to a union catalog more often than colleges in other regions. These ranges, however, are not apparent among the 43% indicating in Table 57 that an interfiled union catalog of materials was not provided.

In those institutions not providing access through a union catalog, approximately half do provide full cataloging treatment of nonprint media:

> Item 28. If 27 is NO, nonprint materials receive full cataloging treatment in a separate media catalog.

TABLE 59

FULL CATALOGING IN SEPARATE MEDIA CATALOG

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1000 | 27 | 25 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 21 | 24 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 24 | 21 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 11 | 30 |
| Total percentages | 23 | 25 |

The total percentages in Table 59 represent the percentage of the entire 267 respondents. Computing percentage responses of only the 117 NO responses to Item 27, it appears that 53% of those institutions not maintaining an interfiled union catalog do provide full

TABLE 60

FULL CATALOGING IN SEPARATE MEDIA CATALOG, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 23 | 29 |
| Central | 29 | 25 |
| Mountain | 16 | 16 |
| Pacific | 31 | 31 |
| South | 16 | 21 |

cataloging treatment for audiovisual materials in a separate media catalog, while 56% do not.

Regional responses appear to have a different pattern. Where response by size showed a greater deviation only in the largest size grouping, regional groupings appear more diverse, with closer correspondence between Northeastern and Central colleges, and between Mountain and Southern. Pacific institutions are closer to the Northeastern and Central, but more evenly divided in responses.

Item 29. If 27 is NO, nonprint media receive short cataloging according to locally-developed standards.

TABLE 61

SHORT CATALOGING WITH LOCAL STANDARDS

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 25 | 15 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 15 | 20 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 24 | 15 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 26 | 7 |
| Total percentages | 22 | 15 |

Adjusting percentage to represent the 117 NO responses to Item 27, it appears that 51.3% of the institutions not providing a union catalog of materials, do provide short cataloging for media according to locally developed standards. 35.9% do not provide short cataloging for audiovisual materials.

TABLE 62

SHORT CATALOGING WITH LOCAL STANDARDS, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 26 | 17 |
| Central | 19 | 19 |
| Mountain | 0 | 33 |
| Pacific | 36 | 10 |
| South | 21 | 11 |

*Percentages shown are of the whole, not of the 117 NO respondents.

When institutions are separated by region, it appears that the Mountain and Pacific colleges show least relationship to those in other regions, and represent the two far ends of the scale of responses. The Pacific institutions are most likely to have short cataloging access for audiovisual materials, and Mountain institutions least likely. For those performing neither full nor short cataloging, the question arises as to what sort of access is provided. This question, however, was not addressed by the survey.

Where cataloging is performed, in 68% of the cases, print and nonprint are handled in the same department.

Item 30. Cataloging of print and nonprint materials is performed in the same department.

Twice as many institutions choose to do all cataloging in one department than otherwise. Size of institution does

TABLE 63

CATALOGING IN THE SAME DEPARTMENT

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 67 | 31 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 73 | 23 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 66 | 33 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 61 | 38 |
| Total percentages | 68 | 30 |

not seem to make an appreciable difference, although the 1501 - 3000 FTE college chooses to do so most often.

TABLE 64

CATALOGING IN SAME DEPARTMENT, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 68 | 29 |
| Central | 67 | 31 |
| Mountain | 83 | 16 |
| Pacific | 57 | 36 |
| South | 69 | 28 |

Pacific colleges appear least likely to utilize the same department for cataloging both print and nonprint materials, but still choose to do so in more than 50% of the institutions.

Responses to the questions on bibliographic access (Item 27 through 30 ) showed no significant differences among the various institutions by either size or location when the chi-square test of independence was applied.

Administration

When it comes to the question of how the college hierarchy views the library and AV center administratively, there are undoubtedly many variations in which they are considered to be one unit. They may share one budget, one director, one building, all of these or none of these:

> Item 31. The college administration considers the library and the AV center as one unit administratively: (A) YES (B) NO.

There may exist a very close relationship cooperatively without being considered to be a unit. Individual (or collective) perceptions may be the key here, but some substantial evidence should be available if college administrators view the operations as one unit.

TABLE 65

ONE UNIT ADMINISTRATIVELY

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 56 | 40 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 57 | 39 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 24 | 72 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 50 | 50 |
| Total percentages | 51 | 45 |

Of the total respondents, 51% indicated that their college administrators viewed the library and AV center as one administrative unit. Size of institution appears to influence administrative views most greatly in the 3001 - 5000 FTE colleges. The table of expectation under the

hypothesis of no difference indicates that this third size grouping does show greatest variation in observed responses from what might be expected.

TABLE 66

MATRIX OF OBSERVED/EXPECTED FREQUENCIES - ITEM 31

| OPTIONS | 500-1500 | 1501-3000 | 3001-5000 | 5001-10,000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 74/68 | 40/35.9 | 8/17.1 | 13/13.9 |
| NO | 53/59 | 27/31.1 | 24/14.9 | 13/12.1 |

In comparing observed frequencies with expected frequencies largest institutions appear to conform most closely in actuality with anticipated results, while the third size group appears to vary most from expected frequencies. Significant difference is shown to be caused by size of institution, ($\chi^2$=11.14, p<.02, df=3).

TABLE 67

ONE UNIT ADMINISTRATIVELY, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 53 | 39 |
| Central | 55 | 43 |
| Mountain | 66 | 33 |
| Pacific | 31 | 63 |
| Southern | 49 | 48 |

Whereas responses from 66% of Mountain state colleges were in the affirmative, only 31% in the Pacific region answered affirmatively. Other regions more closely followed the same pattern variation as the total sample group. No signficant differences were apparent by regional location

when the chi-square test was applied.

One unit, Those answering that the library and AV center were considered one unit were evenly divided in having existed as one unit from the beginning:

> Item 32. If 31 is YES, the two areas have always existed as one unit: (A) YES (B) NO.

Only the 137 respondents with affirmative answers to the above query were requested to answer this item.

TABLE 68

ALWAYS EXISTED AS ONE UNIT

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 55 | 45 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 56 | 44 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 20 | 80 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 7 | 93 |
| Total percentages | 35 | 65 |

Percentages shown are computed only for the number of responses from institutions in each category responding affirmatively to Item 31, represented by Tables 65 and 67. For 65% of the respondents indicating that the college administration viewed the two services as one administrative unit, the library and AV center have not always existed as one unit. This was overwhelmingly true in the largest institutions. Smaller colleges were more likely to have established the library and AV center as one unit, but only in slightly over one-half of the present combined cases was that true.

TABLE 69

MATRIX OF OBSERVED/EXPECTED FREQUENCIES - ITEM 32

| OPTIONS | 500-1500 | 1501-3000 | 3001-5000 | 5001-10,000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 43/35.2 | 25/23.3 | 2/5.2 | 1/7.3 |
| NO | 25/32.8 | 20/21.7 | 8/4.8 | 13/6.7 |

Applying the chi-square test indicates that size is a significant factor in whether an institution has always maintained a single unit for print and nonprint materials, ($\chi^2$=15.59, p<.01, df=3).

TABLE 70

ALWAYS EXISTED AS ONE UNIT, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 43 | 57 |
| Central | 44 | 56 |
| Mountain | 25 | 75 |
| Pacific | 50 | 50 |
| Southern | 60 | 40 |

Again, percentages shown are computed only for the number of responses from institutions answering in the affirmative that the college administration considered the library and the AV center to be one unit administratively. It would appear that more colleges in the Northeast, Central and Mountain regions have moved to consolidate than in other regions. Southern and Pacific institutions were more likely to have originally established their AV center and library as one administrative unit. Application of the

chi-square test, however, indicates that regional location causes no significant difference as to whether a college has always maintained one unit to care for all materials.

Recent merger. The following table also results from a sub-sample based on initial responses to Item 31:

> Item 33. If 31 is YES, the merger of the two units happened within the past five years: (A) YES (B) NO (C) NOT APPLICABLE.

Percentages shown are computed only for the number of responses from institutions answering affirmatively to Item 31. The smaller colleges are more likely to have merged AV

TABLE 71

MERGER WITHIN THE PAST FIVE YEARS

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 33 | 67 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 33 | 67 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 50 | 50 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 56 | 44 |
| Total percentages | 43 | 57 |

center and library more than five years ago, while more of the largest institutions have consolidated during the past five years.

TABLE 72

MERGER WITHIN THE PAST FIVE YEARS, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 33 | 67 |
| Central | 36 | 64 |
| Mountain | 50 | 50 |
| Pacific | 25 | 75 |
| Southern | 41 | 54 |

Percentages in Table 72 are computed only for the number of responses from institutions answering affirmatively that the college administration views the library and AV center as one unit administratively. Regionally, greater percentages of institutions in all except the Mountain states have existed as one unit for more than five years.

Merger consideration, Percentage responses in Tables 73 and 74 represent only those institutions responding in the negative to the question of being viewed as one administrative unit:

> Item 34. If 31 is NO, an administrative merger is being seriously considered: (A) YES (B) NO.

Of those institutions where the library and AV center are not considered to be one unit administratively, only 17.5% are seriously considering such a merger.

TABLE 73

AN ADMINISTRATIVE MERGER IS BEING SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 21 | 79 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 26 | 74 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 16 | 84 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 7 | 93 |
| Total percentages | 17 | 82 |

Response is mainly negative toward the idea of a merger of the AV center and library at the present time. Although 21% of the smallest colleges indicated that such

consideration currently exists, the percentage of those not making such a consideration is almost four times greater. Largest institutions are least likely to be giving serious consideration to merging the two facilities.

TABLE 74

AN ADMINISTRATIVE MERGER IS BEING SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 21 | 79 |
| Central | 27 | 73 |
| Mountain | 0 | 100 |
| Pacific | 27 | 73 |
| Southern | 9 | 91 |

Table 74 indicates that the percentage of institutions in any region giving serious current consideration to an administrative merger of the AV center and library is less than 30%. It appears that Central and Pacific institutions are most likely to be making such consideration, but even there, negative response is nearly three times more prevalent.

Administrative patterns. Various types of administrative styles were explored in Items 35 through 39 of the survey:

> Item 35. Each area is a separate unit with a separate director, one of whom is appointed to coordinate the units: (A) YES (B) NO.

TABLE 75

SEPARATE DIRECTORS, ONE OF WHOM IS COORDINATOR

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 15 | 76 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 17 | 76 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 15 | 75 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 15 | 76 |
| Total percentages | 15 | 75 |

This type of administration apparently has little appeal regardless of institutional size. It is rejected in 75% of all colleges, no matter what the size of the college.

TABLE 76

SEPARATE DIRECTORS, ONE OF WHOM IS COORDINATOR, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 21 | 65 |
| Central | 13 | 81 |
| Mountain | 0 | 100 |
| Pacific | 10 | 04 |
| Southern | 15 | 74 |

Some variation in acceptance is apparent on a regional level. The Northeastern region shows greatest acceptance of the dual directorship of separate units with a coordinator. However, even there, acceptance falls below 25% of the response. The sample from the Mountain region has totally rejected this type of organizational structure.

Autonomous directors. More popular is an administrative model which has the library and AV center

each as a separate unit with a separate director reporting to an appropriate administrative officer:

> Item 36. Each area is a separate unit with a separate Director each reporting to an administrative officer: (A) YES (B) NO.

Of the total respondents, 45% report this type of organization. Size of institution appears to be a factor

TABLE 77

SEPARATE DIRECTORS, EACH REPORTING TO AN ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 40 | 53 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 39 | 56 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 75 | 24 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 50 | 42 |
| Total percentages | 45 | 48 |

in response, with colleges in the 3001 - 5000 FTE size range adopting it 75% of the time. Colleges in the two smaller size ranges are less likely to adopt this type of administrative model than are those in the two larger size ranges.

When the chi-square test is applied, the third size

TABLE 78

MATRIX OF OBSERVED/EXPECTED FREQUENCIES - ITEM 36

| OPTIONS | 500-1500 | 1501-3000 | 3001-5000 | 5001-10,000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 53/59 | 27/31.7 | 25/15.8 | 13/11.5 |
| NO | 70/64 | 39/34.3 | 8/17.2 | 11/12.5 |

grouping appears to be the one most deviant from

expectations. The 3001-5000 FTE student body seems to be the point at which major variations of pattern occur. Choice of this particular administrative model is significantly affected by size, ($\chi^2$=11.33, p<.02, df=3).

TABLE 79

SEPARATE DIRECTOR, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 42 | 51 |
| Central | 47 | 48 |
| Mountain | 66 | 33 |
| Pacific | 57 | 31 |
| Southern | 40 | 50 |

Mountain and Pacific colleges are most likely to have two separate units with autonomous directors reporting directly to an officer in the college administration. In all other regions, this organizational model is accepted in less than one-half of the institutions. No significant difference results from regional location when the chi-square test is applied.

Reporting officer. When the above type of management organization is chosen, it is common for the two directors to report to the same administrative officer:

> Item 37. If 36 is YES, the two Directors report to the same administrative officer: (A) YES (B) NO (C) NOT APPLICABLE.

Thirty-two percent of the institutions choose to have both the AV center director and the library director report to the same officer in the college administrative structure.

TABLE 80

DIRECTORS REPORT TO THE SAME ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

| College Size | YES | NO | N/A | OMIT |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 32 | 6 | 29 | 33 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 23 | 15 | 28 | 34 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 39 | 27 | 15 | 18 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 35 | 23 | 15 | 27 |
| Total percentages | 32 | 17 | 22 | 28 |

The 1501-3000 FTE institution is least likely to have the same reporting officer, while 3001 - 5000 FTE colleges are most likely.

TABLE 81

DIRECTORS REPORT TO THE SAME ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO | N/A | OMIT |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 28 | 14 | 25 | 33 |
| Central | 38 | 7 | 22 | 33 |
| Mountain | 33 | 17 | 33 | 17 |
| Pacific | 42 | 11 | 26 | 21 |
| Southern | 24 | 17 | 29 | 30 |

Variation by region does not appear to be greatly different from variation by size. Pacific colleges use the same reporting administrator most often, while Southern institutions report doing so least often. Neither size nor regional location cause significant differences when the chi-square test of independence is applied.

Title of reporting officer. The following question explored the title of the administrator to whom the two directors reported:

Item 38. If 37 is YES, the directors report to (A) the President (B) Provost/Vice-President (C) Dean (D) Other (E) Not Applicable.

There are so many possible variations that it was impossible to cover them all. However, a pattern did emerge from responses. It appears that most often the college

TABLE 82

REPORTING OFFICER

| College Size | A | B | C | D | E | OMIT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 2 | 9 | 25 | 3 | 21 | 39 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 0 | 17 | 8 | 5 | 21 | 46 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 0 | 27 | 18 | 3 | 15 | 36 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 0 | 23 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 42 |
| Total percent | 1 | 15 | 18 | 3 | 20 | 40 |

administrator to whom the AV center director and the library director report is either the Provost/Vice-President or a Dean.

Percentages are shown for the total number of respondents, rather than for the 32% which answered in the affirmative in Table 80.

Smallest colleges are most likely to choose a Dean, while all other institutions, regardless of size, indicate the Provost/Vice-President. It would appear that the large number selecting the NOT APPLICABLE response reflected a number of respondents answering this item, although they had not answered Item 37 in the affirmative.

The Dean appears to be the most popular college administrative officer for reporting purposes. Pacific and

Southern colleges are the only ones preferring to use the Provost/Vice-President office for reporting. No significant

TABLE 83

REPORTING OFFICER, BY REGION

| Region | A | B | C | D | E | OMIT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 1 | 14 | 17 | 3 | 18 | 45 |
| Central | 1 | 10 | 28 | 7 | 13 | 38 |
| Mountain | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 16 | 16 |
| Pacific | 0 | 31 | 15 | 0 | 21 | 31 |
| Southern | 1 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 28 | 43 |

difference is apparent for either size or region when the chi-square test is applied.

One director. Continuing to explore administrative models, it appears that 48% of the respondents have one director over both the library and the AV center:

> Item 39. The two areas have one Administrator: (A) YES (B) NO.

The 3001 - 5000 FTE colleges break the pattern apparent among colleges of all other sizes. Institutions in that

TABLE 84

ONE DIRECTOR

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 50 | 40 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 55 | 50 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 21 | 72 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 50 | 46 |
| Total percentages | 48 | 45 |

size range are half as likely to have one director over the two areas as are institutions in all other size ranges.

TABLE 85

MATRIX OF OBSERVED/EXPECTED FREQUENCIES - ITEM 39

| OPTIONS | 500-1500 | 1501-3000 | 3001-5000 | 5001-10,000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 67/62.2 | 36/34 | 7/15.9 | 13/12.9 |
| NO | 54/58.8 | 28/32 | 24/15.1 | 12/12.1 |

The third size grouping shows most deviance from the computed expectation, reinforcing the observation that the 3001 - 5000 FTE student body appears to be the critical point in choice of administrative organization.

Of the respondents, 48% have one director over both the library and the AV center, as compared to 45% who answered in the negative. Size plays a significant role in the choice of the administrative model, ($\chi^2$=10.58, p<.02, df=3).

TABLE 86

ONE DIRECTOR, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 46 | 40 |
| Central | 53 | 43 |
| Mountain | 33 | 66 |
| Pacific | 31 | 63 |
| Southern | 48 | 44 |

Regional variations group into two ranges: Mountain and Pacific colleges are least likely to have one director, falling into the low 30% ranges, while Northeast, Southern and Central colleges cluster just above and below the 50% range. Despite these seeming differences, application of

the chi-square test shows that there is no significant difference caused by regional location.

Education of director. One of the crucial questions resulting from a "one director" situation is that concerning the educational qualifications of that director:

> Item 40. If 39 is YES, the Administrator has BOTH a degree in library and in educational media: (A) YES (B) NO.

Those institutions responding that the AV center and library were administered by one director represented 44% of the total number of respondents. The percentages in

TABLE 87

TWO DEGREES

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 3 | 34 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 4 | 47 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 3 | 9 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 11 | 26 |
| Total percentages | 4 | 34 |

Tables 87 and 88 represent the percentages within the total number of respondents. Of the total number responding to the item, 8.5% of the individuals directing the two units hold joint degrees. Most individuals holding joint degrees and serving as director over both AV center and library are in the largest institutions.

It appears that regional location of institution is almost as important as size of college in determining what percentage of joint directors possess both library and media degrees. Colleges in the Northeast appear to be three

times more likely to employ a director of joint facilities

TABLE 88

TWO DEGREES, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 9 | 32 |
| Central | 3 | 38 |
| Mountain | 0 | 33 |
| Pacific | 0 | 26 |
| Southern | 2 | 33 |

with two degrees than are colleges in any other region, and nine times more likely to do so than Mountain and Pacific institutions. Application of the chi-square test results in no significant difference by either size or region.

One degree. It was anticipated that most directors of joint facilities would have a degree either in library or educational media, with a small percentage holding some other academic degree:

> Item 41. If 39 is YES, the Administrator has EITHER a degree in library or in educational media.

The given percentages represent percentages of the total number of respondents, rather than percentages of those answering affirmatively to Item 39 (the two areas have one director), represented by Tables 84 and 86.

Of those responding affirmatively that the AV center and library had one director, 90% answered that the degree was either a library or an educational media degree, while

TABLE 89

ONE DEGREE

| College Size | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 45 | 4 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 49 | 5 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 21 | 0 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 42 | 3 |
| Total percentages | 42 | 4 |

9% answered in the negative.

TABLE 90

ONE DEGREE, BY REGION

| Region | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 39 | 9 |
| Central | 50 | 1 |
| Mountain | 50 | 0 |
| Pacific | 31 | 0 |
| Southern | 40 | 5 |

Regional differences show the same variation pattern as did college size ranges. It appears to be accepted that the joint administrator of these facilities should possess a degree in either print or nonprint media. No significant difference is apparent by either size or region when the chi-square test of independence is applied.

The 48% who answered affirmatively to Item 39 (the two areas have one director), represented by Table 84, were also asked to respond to Item 42:

> Item 42. When the 2 areas have 1 director, that director has (A) library degree (B) educational media degree (C) no formal degree in either but

extensive library experience (D) no formal degree in either but extensive experience in media (E) no formal degree in either but extensive administrative experience.

Responses to this item are shown tabulated in Table 91, following. Of the 48% responding to this item, 44% indicated that the director held a library degree,

TABLE 91

QUALIFICATIONS OF DIRECTOR

| College Size | A | B | C | D | E |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 500 - 1500 | 46 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 1501 - 3000 | 50 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 3001 - 5000 | 21 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5001 - 10,000 | 50 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total percentages | 44 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

1% held a degree in educational media and 3% had no formal degree in either field.

TABLE 92

QUALIFICATIONS OF DIRECTOR, BY REGION

| Region | A | B | C | D | E |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Northeast | 42 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Central | 51 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Mountain | 16 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pacific | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southern | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

Mountain colleges indicated a wide variation from the pattern set by other regions. That is the only region in which the overall director of joint facilities is more likely to possess credentials in educational media. All other regions indicate that holders of library degrees are

most likely to be appointed as director of joint facilities. The Northeast, Central and Southern regions are all more likely to appoint a person with administrative experience than a person with an educational media degree. Individuals with no media degree but extensive experience in the field of either print or nonprint are very unlikely to be appointed director of a joint AV center/library operation.

Application of the chi-square test of independence elicited no significant difference in responses by college size or regional location.

Summary

When region was used as the base from which to compute statistical differences, no items were found which were significantly different from the expectation of equal distribution at the .05 level.

Using size of institution as base, the following items were found to have statistical differences which tested to a degree of significance at the .05, or larger, level: Items 6 (book holdings), 7 (audiovisual holdings), 11 (production unit director), 14 (classroom equipment), 15 (individual equipment use), 16 (equipment maintenance), 17 (staff), 21 (staff differentiation), 23 (same building), 31 (one administrative unit), 32 (always one unit), 36 (separate units), and 39 (one administrator).

# CHAPTER V

# CONCLUSIONS

## Response by Sample

The first conclusion drawn as a result of the survey was that at the four-year college level there is an interest in the "state of the art" of integration of print and nonprint materials. The first of the 67% response was returned within a week, with personal comments, name and phone number attached, clearly an indication that a responsive note had been struck. Despite the emphasis on brevity of response in order to encourage greater participation, 86% of the respondents appended additional comments. Lack of return postage on reply envelopes, and lack of a follow-up mailing did not appear to be a significant reason for non-response, although the former was mentioned quite strongly by one respondent. Personal letters and long-distance phone calls also resulted from the questionnaire.

The 67% response was felt to be great enough to show what the Committee sought: a pattern of the current status of nonprint media on the campuses of four-year college institutions. The response showed 49% were in the 500 - 1500 size range, 25% in the 1501-3000 range, 12% in the 3001-5000 range and 9% between 5001 - 10,000.

## Materials Integration

It was anticipated that most academic libraries above the community college level would have little integration

of print and nonprint materials. This impression resulted, to a great extent, from the background materials read during the review of the literature. It would appear from results gathered from the survey that much has been accomplished since the seventies when most of the literature on the subject of integration of materials had been written:

> Hypothesis I. There is in actuality minimal integration of print and nonprint materials at the four-year academic level.

Although a mere 21.6% of the respondents indicated that their campus had more than a centralized library, this does not indicate how much integration of print/nonprint materials has occurred. It is possible to achieve complete integration of materials within a centralized library, even if an audiovisual center or a production unit is not available.

More important to the integration concept is what occurs within the physical arrangement and the bibliographic access of materials. 54% of the institutions locate the library and AV center in the same building, and 31% of those answering in the negative, service most types of material in one building. Thus, it appears that 85% of the respondents have some sort of physical integration of materials.

Bibliographic access is provided to all types of materials either through an interfiled union catalog (54%), or through separate catalogs with full cataloging (23%). In

68% of the institutions, the cataloging is performed for both print and nonprint materials in the same department, usually an indication that integration is intended. This questionnaire did not attempt to seek out totally integrated facilities, but, rather, to gain an impression of the amount of print/nonprint integration prevalent among four year academic institutions which may not be totally integrated because of reasons other than philosophical viewpoint.

Using the statistics gathered concerning physical housing and bibliographic access, it would appear that the first hypothesis was disproved. It appears that 77% - 85% of the four-year academic institutions surveyed have attempted some integration of print and nonprint resources.

Staff Integration

Early readings, again, gave the impression that practitioners of library science and audiovisual technology were engaged in a battle for supremacy, rather than a cooperative effort to facilitate the use of learning materials. If such was true during the late sixties and early seventies, the climate has apparently changed. The second area of investigation dealt with staff cooperation:

> Hypothesis II. Integration of staff in the print and nonprint areas is minimal.

Integration of staff is more likely to occur in smaller colleges, as might be anticipated due to staff size. In many cases, it is probably the same person, or persons, who

deals with all questions, regardless of subject or type of material. The smaller the institution, the smaller the staff and the greater the integration. Again, the smaller the institution, the more likely an integrated staff works as a resource team in instructional development and/or materials selection. However, when the percentages responding in the affirmative to these questions ranges from 36% - 65% (average 57%) in Item 17 and 38% to 50% in Item 18, one must conclude that Hypothesis 2 as stated is not true; nearly half of the responding institutions have a staff working closely together on print and nonprint materials. Of course, the fact that a large percentage of respondents represent the smallest size institutions may account for this seeming step towards integration. However, the smallest affirmative response is still over one-third of the total for its grouping.

Media production is not included in college support services in 36% of the cases responding. The majority of institutions maintaining such a unit also place additional responsibilities upon that unit. In most cases, directly in relationship to size of institution, the production unit is administered by the same director as the unit which houses and distributes media, and is located in the same building. Less coordination occurs between library and media production staff than between library and instructional development staff. Again, fewer small institutions support a production unit.

Although a staff merger is three times more likely to be in current consideration in the smallest colleges, even among that group, the negative response was decisive. Many of the reasons for negative response to this item were brought out in the written comments appended, and fell overwhelmingly into four responses: library-media centers were already merged, physical facilities were inadequate, staff and/or college administration were opposed (in several cases, because of individual personalities involved), or the present arrangement of services worked very well.

Responses showed a pattern of integration progressing from the greatest degree at the smallest institutional level to the smallest at the larger colleges. One is led to conclude that size greatly influences the organizational pattern of media resources.

Separate Facilities and Directors

Having anticipated minimal integration of materials and staff, it was logical to conclude that most campuses would provide separate library and audiovisual facilities with separate directors:

> Hypothesis III. Most campuses would have separate AV centers and libraries with separate directors.

When affirmative responses to Items 35 and 36 are combined, it appears that 60% of the responding institutions have separate AV centers and libraries with separate directors. However, when Item 39 queries as to whether the two areas

have one director, only 45% answer in the negative. So one can only conclude that between 45% and 60% of the institutions which responded to the questionnaire have separate print and nonprint centers each with its own director. Thus, it appears that close to 50% of the respondents represent campuses maintaining separate facilities.

Organizational Pattern

Size of institution would greatly influence budget, and, therefore, acquisitions of materials, so it was expected that the size would influence the organizational pattern resulting. Smaller colleges probably could not afford to support dual structures, while larger colleges might find a single organization to be unwieldly:

> Hypothesis IV. Size of institution influences organizational pattern.

Comparing response results of Items 36 (separate units with separate directors) and 39 (one director), one discovers that size of institution does indeed influence organizational pattern. However, the pattern shown is surprising. One would expect the largest variations to appear between smallest and largest institutions. In this case, the percentages between smallest and largest institutions are not radically different: the great variation comes in the 3001 - 5000 FTE institutions. This appears to be the point at which it is felt necessary to separate into two units with two directors: it differs from

both larger and smaller institutions. Perhaps these colleges feel that a point has been reached when size prevents one director from fulfilling a dual role, while largest institutions have found it necessary to provide closer cooperation between the two units. Further research might discover the reason for this variation within size grouping. In many responses, the 3001 - 5000 FTE colleges were the ones demonstrating a greater deviation from expected responses, as compared to the pattern established among the other three groupings.

Geographic Location

While it is possible that geographic location might influence integration of materials, it was anticipated that such would not be the case. Although a better economic base might be available in different regions of the country, the differences would result in budget variations which would still reflect college size, rather than location:

> Hypothesis V. Geographic location does not influence amount, or lack, of integration.

Application of the chi-square test of significance using region as a base showed no degree of significance at the .05 level in any of the items. Therefore, the anticipated conclusion (geographic location would not influence amount of integration) remains tenable. Regional location plays no significant part in the organization of college library/media centers.

Integration

The sixties were the time of expansion, while the mid to late seventies were a time of retrenchment. Most colleges where integration was desired would have accomplished it during those years:

> Hypothesis VI. Most institutions wishing integrated facilities and/or staff have already achieved such integration.

Of the respondents, 51% indicated that the college administration considers the library and the AV center to be one unit administratively. In the 45% of cases responding negatively, only 9% are currently considering a merger. Thus, it appears on the surface that it is true that most institutions wishing integrated facilities and/or staff have already achieved such integration. However, from the written comments, it appears that this question needs further research. Many respondents replied to the effect that they personally preferred greater integration of operations, but were prevented because of inadequate physical facilities, personality conflicts, tradition, or lack of backing by college administrators. Those commenting in the negative felt a climate of cooperation was already present to an extent great enough to accomplish mutual goals and objectives without either unit being absorbed by the other.

Qualification of Directors

Although the ideal situation for dual facilities with one administrator would be to have an individual with dual

educational qualifications, it was anticipated that this would be the exception, rather than the norm:

> Hypothesis VII. Individuals with library degrees would be more likely to be the administrator of integrated facilities.

Respondents indicated in 48% of the institutions, that one director oversees both the AV center and the library, and 44% of those directors hold a library degree; only 1% holds a degree in educational media, while 3% have extensive administrative experience without either a library or media degree. Obviously, where an administrator of an integrated facility has only one degree, that degree is normally a library degree. In fact, it was surprising to note that an administrator of an integrated facility was three times more likely to have broad administrative experience without either a library or media degree, than to have only a degree in educational media. The number of combined directors with both library and media degrees was a disappointing 4%. What this means for equal understanding and representation of the two operations is open to speculation.

Hypothesis 7 was proven to be tenable: individuals with library degrees are more likely to be directors of integrated facilities.

Possible Future Research

Since statistical analysis demonstrated that regional location caused no significant differences in responses to any of the items, one could conclude that it would be

possible to conduct a more in-depth survey within one of the major geographic regions, such as the Northeast or the South, and make valid generalizations for the whole country from analysis of that data.

A comparison between academic institutions and large city public libraries within a region could also provide fruitful comparisons. Such a comparison might serve to prove or disprove the idea that academic institutions are much more conservative in the acceptance of new methods and materials than are any other educational institutions.

In many of the items which showed a significant difference caused by size, it was not necessarily a difference between smallest and largest institutions. The 3001 - 5000 FTE college was frequently the size which appeared most significantly different. Investigating print/nonprint material organization within institutions of this size might lead to some interesting reasons for the differences. Perhaps administrators feel a size has been reached which demands separate facilities to develop full potential for materials use: smallest colleges have neither money or staff for such separation, while largest institutions may have found more close coordination essential than what often results from separate facilities. A study aimed solely at 3001 - 5000 FTE college libraries might provide answers to why significant differences appear so often in this group.

Any one of the major divisions of the survey questions

could be expanded to provide a survey in itself. The section on Equipment was the only one which showed significant differences for every item, while Bibliographic Access was the only section in which no item showed significant difference.

The survey had flaws which were not apparent when the committee members tested it, but which became apparent when analysis was attempted. Some of the questions were too vague; it became obvious that some respondents were unclear as to whether or not they should answer a particular question. A sharper precision in questions would have resulted in better data for analysis. However, the basic information sought by the survey was obtained: it is possible to draw conclusions concerning the amount of integration of print and nonprint materials within the libraries of four-year academic institutions.

Some similar type of questionnaire might be developed to survey the question of microcomputer (hardware and software) availability within the academic library. With the rapid expansion of these machines, how is the academic community coping with accessibility; will this be another area in which academic acceptance into the information field will lag behind?

Librarians appear willing to provide information to help in answering questions of vital interest to them, so that questionnaires of this type will remain a valid instrument for obtaining facts from which to draw

statistically reliable conclusions.

# APPENDIX A

State University
of New York
at Oswego

Oswego, New York 13126

January 10, 1983

To: Vice President for Academic Affairs

From: ACRL/Committee on Non-Print Media and the College Library

Re: Survey on Media Integration

The Committee on Non-Print Media and the College Library of the Association of College and Research Libraries is conducting a survey to ascertain to what degree, if any, print and non-print materials and services are integrated. The enclosed questionnaire will take about five minutes to complete. Would you please pass this on to the appropriate person for completion? The survey is being sent to 500 randomly selected colleges.

The Committee is collecting data to see if there is any pattern current in the handling of new media at the four-year academic level. It is anticipated that computer tabulation of the data will make it possible to draw statistical references to what is happening in college library audio-visual centers across the country based on fact. From this information colleges may either affirm their present plan or consider a change.

Thank you for your cooperation. Participants will be sent a copy of the results.

Association of College and Research Libraries
College Library Section
Committee on Non-Print Media and the College Library

Anne Commerton, Chair
Director of Libraries
State University of New York
Oswego, New York 13126

P. Grady Morein, University of Evansville

David H. Eyman, Juniata College

Linda Piele, University of Wisconsin-Parkside

Frank Edgcombe, Christopher Newport College

## GLOSSARY

AV Center - The campus unit separate from the Library responsible for the collection and distribution of audiovisual materials and/or equipment for loan; may include the media production center.

Media Production Center - The campus unit responsible for the production of audiovisual materials for the classroom; may be independent or subordinate to another unit.

Integrated academic library/media center has the following characteristics: 1. coordinated acquisitions and processing, 2. unified bibliographic access, 3. unified effective storage and retrieval, 4. effective access to media equipment, 5. media production.

Library - The traditional curriculum support center which provides access to materials needed to supplement and broaden classroom teaching; may or may not include audiovisual materials as well as print materials

Library Media Area - A library department developed to work with nonprint materials; may or may not loan materials and/or equipment for use outside the library building.

Learning resources are defined as "(1) stored knowledge in whatever form it may be preserved, and (2) the media to store and reproduce it for later use by learners, for presentation by teachers, or for the active developmental use of either" (California State College at Hayward, 1964 p. 17)

Multi-media, audiovisual materials - Those media which are essentially nonprint; does not include microforms.

Resource team - Library reference and media personnel working together with the faculty in implementing new practices.

Actual names may differ locally, e.g., Learning Resources, Educational Materials Center, but the function places the unit into one of the abov categories.

Association of College and Research Libraries

College Library Section

Committee on Non-Print Media and the College Library

## Survey on Media Integration

### Instructions

The attached questionnaire, without comments, takes 5-10 minutes to complete.

Questions 1 through 42 should be answered on the enclosed answer sheet by using a soft (no.2) pencil to black in the appropriate square for the desired answer.

On the questionnaire itself, please answer only the name of the state in which your institution is located (preceding numbered questions) and additional comments (following numbered questions).

Please use the enclosed envelope to return your completed questionnnaire by March 1.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Association of College and Research Libraries
College Library Section
Committee on Non-Print Media and the College Library

Survey on Media Integration

GENERAL INFORMATION

Name the state in which your institution is located:

_____

---

PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS 1-42 ON THE ENCLOSED ANSWER SHEET. SOME QUESTIONS MAY HAVE MORE THAN ONE ANSWER.

1. The College has: (A) a centralized library (B) departmental libraries (C) an audiovisual center (D) a media production unit

2. The College size in student full time equivalent (FTE) is: (A) 500-1500 (B) 1501-3000 (C) 3001-5000 (D) 5001-10,000 (E) Other (Please specify)

3. College setting: (A) urban (B) suburban (C) rural

4. Financial support: (A) private (B) public

5. Respondent: (A) Library Director (B) Director of AV Center (C) Coordinator of Library and AV Center (D) Other (Please give title): _____

---

6. College holdings. Approximate number of library volumes (excluding A-V titles): (A) under 50,000 (B) 50,000-150,000 (C) 150,000-225,000 (D) over 225,000

7. Approximate number of audiovisual titles: (A) under 500 (B) 500-1500 (C) 1500-3000 (D) Over 3000

MEDIA PRODUCTION

8. If there is no media production unit, skip numbers 9 through 13 and mark (E).

9. The media production unit is responsible only for production: (A) Yes (B) No

10. The media production unit is administered by its own director and staff separately from the unit which houses and distributes the software: (A) Yes (B) No

11. The media production unit is administered by the same director as the unit which houses and distributes software: (A) Yes (B) No

12. If 11 is YES, the 2 areas are physically separated: (A) Yes (B) No

13. If 11 is YES, both areas are located in the same building: (A) Yes (B) No

EQUIPMENT

14. Audiovisual equipment distribution for classroom use is done through: (A) the Library (B) the AV Center (C) the production unit (if separate from A & B)

15. Audiovisual equipment loan for individual use is done through: (A) the Library (B) the AV Center (C) the production unit (if separate from A & B) (D) there is no loan for individual use

16. Most audiovisual equipment repair is handled by technicians on: (A) the Library staff (B) the AV Center staff (C) the production staff (if separate from A & B) (D) commerical companies

STAFF

17. Staff dealing with print and nonprint materials work closely together as one unit: (A) Yes (B) No

18. An integrated staff works as a resource team with faculty in instructional development and/or materials selection: (A) Yes (B) No

19. Staff meetings include media staff and library staff: (A) Yes (B) No

20. There is appreciable coordination between library and media production staff: (A) Yes (B) No

21. There is differentiation between media production staff and library staff in titles, status and/or pay: (A) Yes (B) No

22. A staff merger is being considered: (A) Yes (B) No

PHYSICAL BUILDING

23. The Library and the AV Center are located in the same building: (A) Yes (B) No

24. If 23 is NO, most types of media are serviced in one building: (A) Yes (B) No

25. Media is dispersed through the Library, rather than housed in a separate area of the building: (A) Yes (B) No

26. The same loan policies are applied to most print and nonprint materials: (A) Yes (B) No

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ACCESS

27. Bibliographic access is provided through an interfiled union catalog which includes audiovisual materials as well as printed materials: (A) Yes (B) No

28. If 27 is NO, nonprint media receive full cataloging treatment in a separate media catalog: (A) Yes (B) No

29. If 27 is NO, nonprint media receive short cataloging according to locally-developed standards: (A) Yes (B) No

30. Cataloging of print and nonprint materials is performed in the same department: (A) Yes (B) No

ADMINISTRATION

31. The college administration considers the Library and the AV Center one unit administratively: (A) Yes (B) No

32. If 31 is YES, the two areas have always existed as 1 unit: (A) Yes (B) No

33. If 31 is YES, the merger of the two units happened within the past five years: (A) Yes (B) No (C) Not applicable

34. If 31 is NO, an administrative merger is being seriously considered: (A) Yes (B) No

35. Each area is a separate unit with a separate Director, one of whom is appointed to coordinate the units: (A) Yes (B) No

36. Each area is a separate unit with a separate Director, each reporting to an administrative officer: (A) Yes (B) No

37. If 36 is YES, the two Directors report to the same administrative officer: (A) Yes (B) No (C) Not applicable

38. If 37 is YES, the Directors report to: (A) the President (B) the Provost/ Vice President (C) a Dean (D) Other (E) Not applicable

39. The two areas have one Administrator: (A) Yes (B) No
If YES, please answer either 40 or 41.

40. If 39 is YES, the Administrator has BOTH a degree in library and in educational media: (A) Yes (B) No

41. If 39 is YES, the Administrator has EITHER a degree in library or a degree in educational media: (A) Yes (B) No

42. If 39 is YES, please indicate which qualifications are held by the Administrator: (A) Library degree (B) Educational Media degree (C) No formal degree in either library science or educational communications, but extensive experience in library (D) No formal degree in either, but extensive experience in media (E) No formal degree in either library science or educational communications, but extensive administrative experience

Please answer on this sheet or attach additional sheets as needed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Would you recommend closer coordination of Library and AV Center activities on your campus:
   HOW?

2. Would you recommend a complete merger of the Library and AV Center operations on your campus?
   WHY, OR WHY NOT?

3. Would you recommend keeping or reverting to 2 separate units?
   WHY?

4. Additional comments?

# ANSWER SHEET

| SCHOOL OR ORGANIZATION | NAME OF TEST |
|---|---|
| DATE OF TEST MONTH DAY YEAR | GRADE AND SECTION |

**SEE MARKING INSTRUCTIONS**

SPACES FOR STUDENT NUMBER

LAST NAME

SPACES FOR STUDENT NAME

FIRST INITIAL

SECOND INITIAL

**MARKING INSTRUCTIONS**

DIRECTIONS:

Read each question and its numbered answers. When you have decided which answer is correct, blacken the corresponding space on this sheet with a No. 2 pencil. Make no stray marks; they may count against you.

1. CHICAGO is
   a a country d a city
   b a mountain e a state
   c an island

1 a b c ● d

←MAKE NO MARKS BEYOND THIS LINE

| | T | F | | | | | T | F | | | | | T | F | | | | | T | F | | | | | T | F | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | a | b | c | d | e | 31 | a | b | c | d | e | 61 | a | b | c | d | e | 91 | a | b | c | d | e | 121 | a | b | c | d | e | 151 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 2 | a | b | c | d | e | 32 | a | b | c | d | e | 62 | a | b | c | d | e | 92 | a | b | c | d | e | 122 | a | b | c | d | e | 152 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 3 | a | b | c | d | e | 33 | a | b | c | d | e | 63 | a | b | c | d | e | 93 | a | b | c | d | e | 123 | a | b | c | d | e | 153 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 4 | a | b | c | d | e | 34 | a | b | c | d | e | 64 | a | b | c | d | e | 94 | a | b | c | d | e | 124 | a | b | c | d | e | 154 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 5 | a | b | c | d | e | 35 | a | b | c | d | e | 65 | a | b | c | d | e | 95 | a | b | c | d | e | 125 | a | b | c | d | e | 155 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 6 | a | b | c | d | e | 36 | a | b | c | d | e | 66 | a | b | c | d | e | 96 | a | b | c | d | e | 126 | a | b | c | d | e | 156 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 7 | a | b | c | d | e | 37 | a | b | c | d | e | 67 | a | b | c | d | e | 97 | a | b | c | d | e | 127 | a | b | c | d | e | 157 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 8 | a | b | c | d | e | 38 | a | b | c | d | e | 68 | a | b | c | d | e | 98 | a | b | c | d | e | 128 | a | b | c | d | e | 158 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 9 | a | b | c | d | e | 39 | a | b | c | d | e | 69 | a | b | c | d | e | 99 | a | b | c | d | e | 129 | a | b | c | d | e | 159 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 10 | a | b | c | d | e | 40 | a | b | c | d | e | 70 | a | b | c | d | e | 100 | a | b | c | d | e | 130 | a | b | c | d | e | 160 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 11 | a | b | c | d | e | 41 | a | b | c | d | e | 71 | a | b | c | d | e | 101 | a | b | c | d | e | 131 | a | b | c | d | e | 161 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 12 | a | b | c | d | e | 42 | a | b | c | d | e | 72 | a | b | c | d | e | 102 | a | b | c | d | e | 132 | a | b | c | d | e | 162 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 13 | a | b | c | d | e | 43 | a | b | c | d | e | 73 | a | b | c | d | e | 103 | a | b | c | d | e | 133 | a | b | c | d | e | 163 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 14 | a | b | c | d | e | 44 | a | b | c | d | e | 74 | a | b | c | d | e | 104 | a | b | c | d | e | 134 | a | b | c | d | e | 164 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 15 | a | b | c | d | e | 45 | a | b | c | d | e | 75 | a | b | c | d | e | 105 | a | b | c | d | e | 135 | a | b | c | d | e | 165 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 16 | a | b | c | d | e | 46 | a | b | c | d | e | 76 | a | b | c | d | e | 106 | a | b | c | d | e | 136 | a | b | c | d | e | 166 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 17 | a | b | c | d | e | 47 | a | b | c | d | e | 77 | a | b | c | d | e | 107 | a | b | c | d | e | 137 | a | b | c | d | e | 167 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 18 | a | b | c | d | e | 48 | a | b | c | d | e | 78 | a | b | c | d | e | 108 | a | b | c | d | e | 138 | a | b | c | d | e | 168 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 19 | a | b | c | d | e | 49 | a | b | c | d | e | 79 | a | b | c | d | e | 109 | a | b | c | d | e | 139 | a | b | c | d | e | 169 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 20 | a | b | c | d | e | 50 | a | b | c | d | e | 80 | a | b | c | d | e | 110 | a | b | c | d | e | 140 | a | b | c | d | e | 170 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 21 | a | b | c | d | e | 51 | a | b | c | d | e | 81 | a | b | c | d | e | 111 | a | b | c | d | e | 141 | a | b | c | d | e | 171 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 22 | a | b | c | d | e | 52 | a | b | c | d | e | 82 | a | b | c | d | e | 112 | a | b | c | d | e | 142 | a | b | c | d | e | 172 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 23 | a | b | c | d | e | 53 | a | b | c | d | e | 83 | a | b | c | d | e | 113 | a | b | c | d | e | 143 | a | b | c | d | e | 173 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 24 | a | b | c | d | e | 54 | a | b | c | d | e | 84 | a | b | c | d | e | 114 | a | b | c | d | e | 144 | a | b | c | d | e | 174 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 25 | a | b | c | d | e | 55 | a | b | c | d | e | 85 | a | b | c | d | e | 115 | a | b | c | d | e | 145 | a | b | c | d | e | 175 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 26 | a | b | c | d | e | 56 | a | b | c | d | e | 86 | a | b | c | d | e | 116 | a | b | c | d | e | 146 | a | b | c | d | e | 176 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 27 | a | b | c | d | e | 57 | a | b | c | d | e | 87 | a | b | c | d | e | 117 | a | b | c | d | e | 147 | a | b | c | d | e | 177 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 28 | a | b | c | d | e | 58 | a | b | c | d | e | 88 | a | b | c | d | e | 118 | a | b | c | d | e | 148 | a | b | c | d | e | 178 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 29 | a | b | c | d | e | 59 | a | b | c | d | e | 89 | a | b | c | d | e | 119 | a | b | c | d | e | 149 | a | b | c | d | e | 179 | a | b | c | d | e |
| 30 | a | b | c | d | e | 60 | a | b | c | d | e | 90 | a | b | c | d | e | 120 | a | b | c | d | e | 150 | a | b | c | d | e | 180 | a | b | c | d | e |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



NCS E 1497:109878

# APPENDIX B

State University
of New York
at Oswego

Oswego, New York 13126

September 15, 1983

To: Participants in Survey conducted by ACRL/CLS Committee
on Non-Print Media and the College Library

In the spring, you participated in a survey concerning the degree of integration of print and non-print materials, services and personnel in four-year colleges, conducted by ACRL/College Library Section Committee on Non-Print Media and the College Library.

Response was 67%, without a second reminder mailing. Eighty-six percent of the respondents added comments which confirmed our belief that this is a subject of great interest to many of you.

A master compilation of answer results was made, as well as various computer manipulated analyses. We are sending to those who responded, a copy of the master answer sheet together with a descriptive analysis appropriate to the college size category.

The written comments were most interesting, and we hope to include some of those in an article which will give a complete analysis of the survey results.

Thank you for your cooperation; we hope you will find this interesting and useful.

Anne Commerton, Chairperson
Association of College and Research Libraries
College Library Section
Committee on Non-Print Media and the College Library

## Results of Survey on Media Integration

1. The College has:
   - A. a centralized library 80%
   - B. departmental libraries 1%
   - C. an audiovisual center .8%
   - D. a media production unit .3%

   Combinations: A & B 1.1%; A & C 6%; A,B, & C 1.6%; A,C, & D 8%; A,B,C, & D 2%; A & D .8%

2. The College size in student full time equivalet (FTE) is:
   - A. 500-1500 49%
   - B. 1501-3000 25%
   - C. 3001-5000 12%
   - D. 5001-10,000 9%
   - E. Other (Please specify) 1%

3. College setting:
   - A. urban 36%
   - B. suburban 23%
   - C. rural 38%

4. Financial support:
   - A. private 70%
   - B. public 28%

5. Respondent:
   - A. Library Director 62%
   - B. Director of AV Center 10%
   - C. Coordinator of Library & AV Center 3%
   - D. Other (Please give title) 19%

6. College holdings. Approximate number of library volumes (excluding A-V titles):
   - A. under 50,000 2%
   - B. 50,000-150,000 48%
   - C. 150,000-225,000 23%
   - D. over 225,000 24%

7. Approximate number of audiovisual titles:
   - A. under 500 19%
   - B. 500-1500 22%
   - C. 1500-3000 20%
   - D. over 3000 33%

MEDIA PRODUCTION

8. If there is no media production unit, skip numbers 9 through 13 and mark (E). 36%

9. The media production unit is responsible only for production:
   - A. Yes 10%
   - B. No 41%

10. The media production unit is administered by its own director and staff separately from the unit which houses and distributes the software:

| | |
|---|---|
| A. Yes | 10% |
| B. No | 43% |

11. The media production unit is administered by the same director as the unit which houses and distributes software:

| | |
|---|---|
| A. Yes | 42% |
| B. No | 9% |

12. If 11 is YES, the 2 areas are physically separated:

| | |
|---|---|
| A. Yes | 13% |
| B. No | 30% |

13. If 11 is YES, both areas are located in the same building:

| | |
|---|---|
| A. Yes | 34% |
| B. No | 5% |

EQUIPMENT

14. Audiovisual equipment distribution for classroom use is done through:

| | |
|---|---|
| A. the Library | 28% |
| B. the AV Center | 58% |
| C. the production unit (if separate from A & B) | 3% |

15. Audiovisual equipment loan for individual use is done through:

| | |
|---|---|
| A. the Library | 25% |
| B. the AV Center | 52% |
| C. the production unit (if separate from A & B) | 2% |
| D. there is no loan for individual use | 14% |

16. Most audiovisual equipment repair is handled by technicians on:

| | |
|---|---|
| A. the Library staff | 4.5% |
| B. the AV Center staff | 42% |
| C. the production staff (if separate from A & B) | 4.5% |
| D. commercial companies | 42% |

STAFF

17. Staff dealing with print and nonprint materials work closely together as one unit:

| | |
|---|---|
| A. Yes | 57% |
| B. No | 40% |

18. An integrated staff works as a resource team with faculty in instructional development and/or materials selection:

| | |
|---|---|
| A. Yes | 48% |
| B. No | 48% |

19. Staff meetings include media staff and library staff:

| | |
|---|---|
| A. Yes | 49% |
| B. No | 47% |

20. There is appreciable coordination between library and media production staff:

| | |
|---|---|
| A. Yes | 46% |
| B. No | 40% |

21. There is differentiation between media production staff and library staff in titles, status and/or pay:
    A. Yes 41%
    B. No 43%

22. A staff merger is being considered:
    A. Yes 12%
    B. No 64%

PHYSICAL BUILDING

23. The Library and the AV Center are located in the same building:
    A. Yes 54%
    B. No 40%

24. If 23 is NO, most types of media are serviced in one building:
    A. Yes 31%
    B. No 12%

25. Media is dispersed through the Library, rather than housed in a separate area of the building:
    A. Yes 31%
    B. No 65%

26. The same loan policies are applied to most print and nonprint materials:
    A. Yes 29%
    B. No 67%

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ACCESS

27. Bibliographic access is provided through an interfiled union catalog which includes audiovisual materials as well as printed materials:
    A. Yes 54%
    B. No 43%

28. If 27 is NO, nonprint media receive full cataloging treatment in a separate media catalog:
    A. Yes 23%
    B. No 25%

29. If 27 is NO, nonprint media receive short cataloging according to locally-developed standards:
    A. Yes 22%
    B. No 15%

30. Cataloging of print and nonprint materials is performed in the same department:
    A. Yes 68%
    B. No 30%

ADMINISTRATION

31. The college administration considers the library and the AV Center one unit administratively:
    A. Yes 51%
    B. No 45%

32. If 31 is YES, the two areas have always existed as 1 unit:
    A. Yes 27%
    B. No 28%

33. If 31 is YES, the merger of the two units happened within the past five years:
    A. Yes 12%
    B. No 21%
    C. Not applicable 25%

34. If 31 is NO, an administrative merger is being seriously considered:
    A. Yes 9%
    B. No 38%

35. Each area is a separate unit with a separate Director, one of whom is appointed to coordinate the units:
    A. Yes 15%
    B. No 75%

36. Each area is a separate unit with a separate Director, each reporting to an administrative officer:
    A. Yes 45%
    B. No 48%

37. If 36 is YES, the two Directors report to the same administrative officer:
    A. Yes 30%
    B. No 12%
    C. Not applicable 23%

38. If 37 is YES, the Directors report to:
    A. the President 1%
    B. the Provost/Vice President 15%
    C. a Dean 18%
    D. Other 3%
    E. Not applicable 20%

39. The two areas have one Administrator:
    A. Yes 48%
    B. No 45%
    If YES, please answer either 40 or 41.

40. If 39 is YES, the Administrator has BOTH a degree in library and in educational media:
    A. Yes 4%
    B. No 34%

41. If 39 is YES, the Administrator has EITHER a degree in library or a degree in educational media:
    A. Yes 42%
    B. No 4%

42. If 39 is YES, please indicate which qualifications are held by the Administrator:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. | Library degree | 44% |
| B. | Educational Media degree | 1% |
| C. | No formal degree in either library science or educational communications, but extensive experience in library | 0 |
| D. | No formal degree in either, but extensive experience in media | 0 |
| E. | No formal degree in either library science or educational communications, but extensive administrative experience | 3% |

## RESULTS OF SURVEY ON MEDIA INTEGRATION

The purpose of the survey was to collect data from library and/or audiovisual directors in order to see if there is any pattern current in the handling of newer media at the four-year academic level.

A stratified random sample of four hundred four-year undergraduate institutions was selected from within the 500-10,000 FTE (full-time equivalent) student range. Colleges having fewer than 500 FTE were eliminated, as it was felt that their situations would not provide a picture typical of the majority of institutions represented. A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education published by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1976) was used to obtain college names within three size ranges: 501-1000; 1001-5000; 5001-10,000. A proportional number from each size grouping was chosen in relation to the total number of colleges within each size grouping. We realized, of course, that this list, drawn up seven years ago, could not be totally accurate, but felt changes of student population in individual institutions would not be so drastic as to change the size grouping into which most of the colleges were placed. No attempt was made to select colleges geographically: Alaska, Hawaii, Montana and Wyoming are not represented on the final list of colleges selected for the survey.

Dr. Thomas Mustico of the Department of Secondary Education wrote and ran a program on the TRS 80 Model III microcomputer which randomly selected 104 colleges in the size range of 50-1000; 240 colleges in the size range of 1001-5000; and 56 colleges in the size range of 5001-10,000, making a total of 400, or 41% of the total number of colleges within these size ranges on the Carnegie lists for "Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I and II" and "Liberal Arts Colleges I and II." Of the 400 colleges selected, 396 were actually sent questionnaires; no addresses could be located for the other four institutions, leading us to conclude that they had either merged with other institutions, changed names, or closed their doors.

The questionnaire was pretested by members of the ACRL Committee with special emphasis on the amount of time required to complete the survey. It was felt that even the busiest individual could find five to ten minutes to devote to answering a survey if it has relevancy. Of course, additional comments take additional time, but this hindered only 14% of the respondents from adding suggestions, comments and further information.

Why was the questionnaire directed to the Academic Vice President rather than the College Library Director? Originally the idea was to send two copies of the survey, asking that one be completed by the Library Director, the other by the Audiovisual Director. Comparison of answers given would undoubtedly reflect two different perspectives and reveal interesting information. This, however, was rejected as being too unwieldy to handle, and too likely to cause conflict in answers which might prevent valid conclusions from being drawn. It was felt that it would also be revealing to see to whom the Academic Vice President forwarded the survey for completion. Of course, the fact that a library group was conducting the survey might influence the choice, as would lack of an appropriate audiovisual director. In any case, 62% of the responses were from library directors, 10% from directors of AV Centers, 5% from Coordinators of two units and 19% from others, including college administrators, or middle-management library and media personnel.

270 responses were received, but four arrived after the tabulation of the surveys by the College Computer Center, so the 67% return response represents 266 surveys. The initial sort was by geographic location of respondents. Originally, the intention was to list five geographic areas, asking each respondent to choose the most appropriate. The committee felt, however, that this might lead to confusion in results, depending on an individual's perception as to which area his/her institution was located. Therefore, each respondent was asked to list the state in which the institution was located. Five geographic areas were chosen, as listed in the U.S. Census publication State and Metropolitan Area Data Book, 1982, "Table C, Area and Population; Regions, Divisions and States" (p.448). Responses were manually sorted to conform to the following groupings: NORTHEAST AND MIDATLANTIC including Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania; CENTRAL including Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North and South Dakota, Nebraska and Kansas; SOUTH including Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas; MOUNTAIN including Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada; and PACIFIC including Washington, Oregon, California.

The responses within these geographic areas revealed the same relative percentage rankings as did the Census population rankings of each area, greatest numbers in the Southern states and least from the Mountain states.

80% of total respondents had only a centralized library, 1% claimed departmental libraries. The most popular combination of services, 8%, was a centralized library together with an audiovisual center and media production unit; 6% combined the audiovisual center (or room) with the library; 2% combined all facilities: centralized library, departmental libraries, an audiovisual center and a media production unit. .8% had a centralized library and a media production unit, but not an audiovisual center.

Item 2 introduced a fourth size grouping into the original three, with 49% of those responding ranging in size from 500-1500 FTE students; 25% having 1501-3000; 12% falling within the range of 3001-5000; 9% grouping between 5001-10,000 and 1% others which should have fallen outside the original sample. These size groupings were used to run the second computer sort on the collected data.

Within the total sample, location was well diversified. 36% considered their location to be urban, 38% said they were rural and only 23% fell into the suburban category. As might be expected, the Central area colleges were 46% rural, while the Northeast/Midatlantic areas found their highest number, 44%, to be urban; Pacific area was high in suburban locations with 42%. Larger institutions (5001-10,000) were more likely to be located in rural areas according to 50% of those responses, as were 49% of the smallest institutions (500-1500).

As for who pays the bills in the responding institutions, it appears that 70% of the respondents are supported by private funds. This ranges from a high 81% in the Central states to a low 33% in the Mountain states. 92% of the small colleges are privately funded, while 76% of the 5001-10,000 FTE colleges are supported by public funds.

It is to be expected that the smaller schools would be the ones with the smallest collections, but only 2% admitted to under 50,000 library volumes with the majority (71%) falling within the two middle ranges. 88% of the larger schools owned over 225,000 volumes. The largest audiovisual collections would appear to be in the Mountain states where 66% hold more than 3000 titles. And, again, the larger the college, the larger the audiovisual collection, with 65% of those schools owning over 3000 titles.

Of the total number replying to the survey, 36% have no production unit for audiovisual materials. Computing average responses from those institutions which maintain production units, 65% say that unit has added responsibilities other than production; 67% are administered by the same director as the unit which houses and distributes software, and in 80% of those cases, both areas are located in the same building. 41% of the smallest colleges indicate no production unit, as compared to 23% of the largest schools.

The 58% of total respondents who distribute audiovisual equipment through the AV Center range from 33% in Mountain states to 73% in the Pacific. 88% of the largest colleges distribute this way, as do 50% of the smallest. 14% report that they have no loan of equipment for individual use, and of the 14%, surprisingly 21% fall in the third size category (3001-5000).

Maintenance of the audiovisual equipment by its own AV Center staff is performed by 42%, while the same percentage pay for such services from commercial companies. This is less true for those in Pacific states, who opt 26% for commercial repair as compared to 57% maintenance by AV Center staff. As might be anticipated, 58% of the smallest colleges employ outside firms for repair, while almost the same percentage (57%) of the largest schools maintain their own audiovisual equipment repair staff.

Slightly more than half ( 57%) say staff working with print and with nonprint work closely together. In some cases, of course, it would be the same person or persons, as is reflected in progressively lower reporting "yes" percentages for each size group. So we find 65% coordination in smallest schools and 50% in the largest. There appears to be a discrepancy from staff working closely as one unit to the next higher level of coordination where an integrated staff works as one resource team in instructional development on materials selection. This may result from the concept of an integrated staff, or it may mean instructional development is not done. Again, the smaller the school, the more likely this integrated staff coordination is, 50% compared to 38% (5001-10,000). The same trend appears in joint staff meetings, with smallest institutions meeting jointly 54% of the time, progressing down to 46% in largest institutions. Wide percentage ranges are found from one geographic area to another. The Southern states maintain a 47%-48% equilibrium, while the Mountain states report 83% joint meetings, 36% in the Pacific, 61% in the Central and 39% in the Northeast, a fairly wide variation.

46% report close coordination between library and media production staff, with the same trend evident as above, progressing from closest coordination in smallest schools to least in largest. Central and Mountain states report 51% and 50% respectively in their coordinated efforts. Interestingly, though, it is the Northeast which pairs with the Mountain states in reporting differentiation between these two staffs in titles, status/or pay. There is such difference in 50% of the cases, while the Central states report 37% and the South 38%. The Pacific stands alone, in between, with 42% reporting such differences. As far

as staff mergers, there is either little interest, or the interest is not at the level which can accomplish it. Overall, 12% report considering such a merger, with a low of 7% making such consideration in the South and a high of 31% in the Pacific states. Size of institution does not appear to make a difference.

54% report that the Library and the Audiovisual Center are located in the same building and 78% of those not housed together do service most types of media in one building. Least likely to house the units together are those colleges in the 3001-5000 size range, which combined with the written comments, leads to the conclusion that space is often the deciding factor on this question. 78% of those which do not have the Library and AV Center housed in the same building do have most types of media handled in one building. Only 31% disperse their media throughout the building, rather than housing it in a separate area of the building. Smaller libraries are more likely to disperse than larger units which tend to collect it into one area.

It is not surprising that loan policies differ between print and nonprint media. Only 29% say the loan period is the same, with largest schools more often responding in the affirmative.

Bibliographic access through an interfiled union catalog is, perhaps, one of the easiest ways to unify a collection which is split because of space, personnel, or budget. It would seem that those interested in close coordination of materials access, regardless of format, would seek this means of expressing their philosophic commitment to coordination. If this assumption is correct, only 54% of our survey respondents have a commitment to unified access, while 43% do not provide such access. The Mountain states rank this as of high priority, with 66% providing a union catalog; Southern institutions reply in the affirmative 62% of the time, with Central and Northeastern libraries trailing behind with 51% affirmative. Pacific institutions are almost the exact reverse of the South, replying 31% affirmative and 63% negative. These wide ranges, however, are not apparent among the total 43% who stated that an interfiled union catalog of materials was not provided. In those institutions not providing access through a union catalog, approximately half do provide full cataloging treatment of nonprint media. This split was fairly consistent among all regions. The Pacific institutions are more likely to provide short cataloging of media according to local standards, and the Mountain institutions least likely. Where cataloging is performed, in 68% of the cases print and non-print are handled in the same department. This ranges from a high of 83% in the Mountain states to a low of 57% in the Pacific states; clustering together in the middle ranges are the Central, Northeast and Southern states, reporting 67%, 68% and 69% respectively.

When it comes to the question of how the college hierarchy views the Library and AV Center administratively, there are undoubtedly many variations in which they are considered to be one unit: they may share one budget, one director, one building, all of these, or none of these. There may exist a very close relationship cooperatively without being considered to be a unit. Individual (or collective) perceptions may be the key here, but some substantial evidence should be available if college administrators view the operations as one unit. 51% of the total respondents answered that their college administrators considered the Library and the AV Center to be one unit administratively. 66% of Mountain state colleges found this to be true, while only 31% in Pacific states answered affirmatively. Southern, Northeastern and Central institutions reported 49%, 53% and 55% in the affirmative. Those answering "Yes" to this

question were evenly divided in having existed as one unit from the beginning. This was echoed in the same 50-50 division in the Pacific, with 66% of those in the South responding that they had always been one unit, 49% in the Central, 47% in the Northeast and 25% in the Mountain states. Of the 75% of institutions in the Mountain states which have merged their libraries and AV centers, 50% have done so in the past five years. 50% of Pacific and Central state institutions which are administratively one have also accomplished the merger in the past five years, while 53% in the Northeast, 43% in the Central region and 32% in the South have taken the step since 1978.

It would appear that those institutions which had any interest in merging their library and AV center have already done so. Of those which are NOT already considered to be one unit administratively, only 20% are seriously considering such a merger. None in the Mountain states are giving serious consideration to such a change, 9% in the South, 24% in the Northeast, 25% in the Pacific, and a high of 32% in Central states. However, the comments offered by many of the institutions clarify reasons why some institutions are not making such serious considerations. As could be expected, valid reasons cover all aspects of the question from lack of staff support to lack of physical space, to budgetary problems. Depending on the philosophy of those making such decisions, many of the same reasons are used to support a merger or to support separate facilities.

Various types of coordinated administrative styles were explored in the next few questions in this section of the survey. A compromise situation to a complete merger in which each area (library and AV center) exists as a separate unit with a separate Director, one of whom is appointed to coordinate the units, has apparently been rejected by a great majority of institutions--75%. This rejection is true of all areas in the country, ranging from a low of 65% in the Northeast to 100% in those Mountain state institutions surveyed. More popular is an administrative model which has the Library and the AV Center each as a separate unit with a separate Director reporting to an appropriate administrative officer. 45% of the total report this type of organization, with 48% in the negative. It is most popular in the Mountain (66%) and Pacific (57%) states and least popular in the South (40%). With this type of organization, 68% of the institutions have the two Directors reporting to the same administrative officer. Which administrative officer cannot be correctly computed, as, based on the questionnaire wording, only 30% of the total number of respondents should have answered this question, rather than the 57% who did answer. Based on that 57% of the total, rather than the expected 30% who answered question 37 in the affirmative, it is possible to see definite patterns. 1% of the institutions have the two directors reporting to the President, 15% to the Provost/Vice President, 18% to a Dean, 3% to some other official and 20% marked Not Applicable. There are so many possible variations that it is simpler to note the majority in each region to see how administrative lines are drawn: Mountain, Central and Northeastern states favor reporting to a Dean; Southern and Pacific states prefer the Provost/Vice President as reporting official. The Northeast is the only area which shows any ambivalence, the Dean topping the Provost/Vice President by a mere 3% of replies.

In 48% of the replies, the library and the AV center have one director, as compared to 45% who answered in the negative. Again, the Mountain and Pacific area institutions bear a close affinity in reporting 33% and 31% respectively in the affirmative. The Northeast, South and Central institutions cluster together with one director in 46%, 48%, and 53% affirmative respectively. One of the crucial questions resulting from a "one director" situation is, "What degree or degrees

is/are required for that Director?" Total responses indicate that 4% have a degree in both library science and educational media, 42% have a degree in either library science or educational media, of which 44% have earned a library degree, 1% possess a degree in educational media and a surprising 3% have no formal degree in either library science or educational media but possess extensive administrative experience. This appears to imply that persons with a library degree have an immense edge over those with a degree in educational media, and that experience in administration also ranks above a degree in educational media. Interesting avenues for speculation: perhaps those immersed in educational media prefer the challenge of instructional development, or of classroom interaction, to the administrative track, or perhaps they prefer to work only with non-print media, rather than directing the print world, also. Only further research on holders of such degrees can give an answer. To recapitulate these results by area of the country, for those facilities which are administered by one Director:

| | Northeast | South | Central | Mountain | Pacific |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Both degrees | 9% | 2% | 3% | 0 | 0 |
| Library degree only | 42% | 43% | 51% | 16% | 31% |
| Educational media degree only | 1% | 0 | 2% | 33% | 0 |
| No degree in above—admin. experience | 7% | 4% | 1% | 0 | 0 |

Further analysis needs to be done on the statistics resulting from this survey in order to see where significant differences occur. The above serves as an introductory narrative to what trends appear in the various regions of the country as far as the integration, or lack thereof, of print and nonprint media in four-year undergraduate colleges. Analysis also needs to be made using size of the institution as a base from which to judge occurrences, if any, of significant trends.

CVR/dk
6/83

## SELECTED COMPARISONS

In an attempt to draw some comparisons with selected answers, questions were grouped within the various subdivisions to see what relationship answers bore to each other. Grouping General Information questions 2, 6, 7 gave the following statistics: 49% of the total 266 responses were from colleges which fell within the 500-1500 FTE student size category, although the number of colleges within this size range which received questionnaires was only 26% of the total sent. 25% of responses were from colleges with 1501-3000 students; 12% respondents in the 3001-5000 student range and 9% fell within the largest size range. The two middle groupings (1501-5000) from which 37% responded had received 60% of the questionnaires and the largest size group received 14% of the surveys. With such a large percentage of responses from smaller size institutions, it is not surprising that college holdings of library volumes fell within the lower end of the scale: 48% hold 50,000-150,000 volumes; 23% hold 150,000-225,000; 24% over 225,000, and only 2% less than 50,000 volumes. The approximate number of audiovisual titles fared better in that the largest percentage of holdings fell at the top of the scale: 33% hold over 3000 audiovisual titles; 20% hold between 1500 and 3000; 22% hold 500-1500 and 19% own less than 500 titles. Of course, individual interpretation of what is considered to be audiovisual holdings may well differ considerably, with many smaller colleges owning large numbers of sound recordings and lesser numbers of videotapes, filmstrips, etc. However, it is interesting to note that non-print materials have proven their suitability in all settings, regardless of size.

The Media Production questions grouped for comparison were numbers 9, 10, 12 and 13. Since 36% responded that there was no media production unit on their campus, one would expect that 64% of the respondents would answer the following questions, but such was not the case. While 41% said "No" to the statement that the media production unit was responsible ONLY for production, only 10 responded "Yes". In 10% of the cases, this unit has its own director and staff separate from the unit which houses and distributes the software, and in 42% of cases the media production unit is administered by the same director as the unit housing and distributing software. Where the same director and staff manage the media production unit and distribute software, these two areas are located in the same building in 80% of the cases.

Audiovisual equipment distribution for classroom use is handled by the AV Center in 58% of the institutions, by the Library in 28% and by a separate production unit in 3%. The same pattern follows when equipment loan is made for individual use: 52% of the colleges handle this service through the AV Center, 25% through the Library, 2% through the production unit, and 14% have no equipment loan for individual use.

Answers dealing with staff handling of print and non-print materials present a fairly even distribution of diverse responsibilities. While the staff handling these materials work closely together as one unit in 57% of the cases, many of these indicate that the same person or persons are responsible, that there is not a large enough staff for such specialization, and 40% do not work closely together. However, when it comes to instructional development and/or materials selection, 48% work with an integrated staff and 48% do not. Staff meetings include both media and library staff in 49% of the colleges, but not in 47%. 46% of the institutions do have appreciable coordination between media production and library staff but 40% do not, which equals the percentage of

staffs which do not work closely in dealing with print and non-print materials. Despite the coordination of media production and library staffs, only 41% respond that there is no difference in titles, status and/or pay. One might expect a difference in titles, so the difference which would matter would be in status or pay, and might be an interesting avenue to pursue. This combination was an unfortunate one, in that it did not get at the root of what was really wanted for information. Apparently, whatever mergers were desired have already occurred, as only 12% admit to present consideration of one, while 64% indicate that no merger is being considered. Obviously, the reasons often given for unified operation of all learning materials production, access and distribution have not convinced a great number of people. As indicated in responses to question 1 indicating what facilities an institution supported, less than 20% showed a combination of services. Perhaps fully integrated facilities did not find an appropriate answer to mark, or did not realize that it was appropriate to indicate multiple responses, or, perhaps, it is true that only an approximate 20% have integrated facilities as indicated.

Often the physical buildings and their arrangement create problems which cannot be overcome despite a philosophic commitment to integration. Often there is just so much space with which to work and it becomes a matter of compromise in how materials and services are distributed. Survey respondents indicated that the Library and AV Center are located in the same building in 54% of the cases. Media located in the Library is housed in a separate area of the building (rather than integrated with the print collection) in 65% of the cases. Only 29% of respondents apply the same loan policies to print and non-print materials.

When it comes to bibliographic access to the materials, 54% of the colleges provide an interfiled union catalog to both print and non-print materials. However, whatever type of cataloging is provided for the materials, 68% perform the work for both in the same department.

Comparing the results of the questions dealing with administration revealed that 51% of the institutions considered the Library and AV Center as one administrative unit. 27% of those have always existed as one, while 12% have merged in the past five years. Of the 45% which are not one administrative unit, only 20% are now seriously considering such a merger. When two separate units are involved, only 15% of the institutions have one of the Directors as a Coordinator and the 45% of cases with separate Directors report to the same college administrator 68% of the time.

CVR/dk
6/83

## SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS BY SIZE: 500-1500

When we break down the total number of responses by size of FTE student body, where do differences lie as far as staff, equipment, physical facilities and administration are concerned? First looking at the 49% of total responses which were received from colleges in the 500-1500 size grouping; it appears these schools are 34% urban, 26% suburban and 37% rural in setting and are funded with private money in 92% of the cases. 70% of the survey responses came from library directors, 8% from Audiovisual directors, 3% from a coordinator of library and AV facilities and a surprisingly large 16% from others: academic vice-presidents, other administrators, and middle management staff. Library holdings for these institutions find 70% holding between 50,000 and 150,000 volumes; 2% under 50,000; 17% between 150,000-225,000, and 9% over 225,000 volumes. Holdings for audiovisual titles do not show such a wide variation: 27% under 500; 23% between 500-1500; 19% between 1500-3000; and 25% own over 3000.

Media production, however, appears to be a luxury not provided by 41% of colleges this size. Of those institutions which do provide media production service, 35% of those units have additional responsibilities to production. 39% of the production units are administered by a director and staff separately from the software distribution/housing unit, while 40% have the same director and staff. Of the 40% jointly administered, 32% are located in the same building.

Equipment distribution falls to the authority of the AV Center in 50% of the colleges, while the library handles it in 38%. However, when it comes to loan of audiovisual equipment for individual use, 15% have no loan, 34% is handled by the library and 45% by the AV Center. Repair of equipment is contracted to commercial companies in 58% of the institutions, while 32% use the AV Center staff for maintenance and 5%, the library staff.

The fact that staff dealing with print and non-print materials work closely together as one unit in 65% of the cases probably reflects a smaller size staff where one person combines responsibilities. Instructional development and/or materials selection is performed by an integrated staff in 50% of the institutions. Staff meetings include media and library staff in 54% of the colleges, but in that same 54% there is differentiation in titles, status and/or pay. 59% of the institutions are not considering a staff merger.

62% of the AV centers and libraries are located in the same building, and in the 33% which are not, 89% service most types of media in one building. 58% house media in a separate area of the library and 62% have different loan policies for print and non-print materials.

In these smaller institutions, 50% provide an interfiled union catalog. Of the 47% who do not have such bibliographic access, 27% provide full cataloging in a separate media catalog, while the remaining perform short cataloging. Whatever happens as far as cataloging, in 67% of the colleges, it all happens in the same department for print and non-print.

When it comes to smaller institutions with smaller staffs, how is the administration of these materials handled? In 56% of the institutions, the college administration considers the Library and the AV Center to be one unit administratively, and 58% of these instances have always existed as one unit, with 23% occurring within the last five years, and 23% seriously considering a merger at

this time. In only 15% of the institutions are there two separate Directors over two separate units, with one Director appointed as Coordinator. 40% of the colleges have separate Directors for the separate units, each one reporting to an administrative officer. 79% of the directors report to the same officer and in an overwhelming percentage of the time, it is a Dean, with the Provost/Vice President, another unnamed administrator and the President following in that order. In 50% of the institutions, the AV Center and Library are handled by one director. 6% of these cases, and 3% of total respondents have incumbent directors holding degrees in both library and educational media. In chart form, qualifications required of directors are as follows:

| | Joint AV-Lib. Dir. |
|---|---|
| Library degree | 91% |
| Educational media degree | 3% |
| Neither degree but extensive admin. exper. | 9% |
| Both degrees | 6% |

CVR/dk
6/83

## SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS BY SIZE: 1501-3000

Within the second size grouping, 1501-3000 FTE student body, 33% are located in urban areas, 21% in suburban, and 44% in rural. They are privately funded in 59% of the cases. A good mix of respondents is included in this group with 56% being library directors, 13% AV Center Directors, 2% Coordinators of Library and AV Center, and 24% someone with another title. Library holdings cluster in the upper ranges (39% reporting 50-150,000 volumes; 34% with 150,000-225,000; 24% over 225,000) although 1% report holdings under 50,000 volumes. Audiovisual holdings, again, run the full range from 15% owning under 500 titles, 23% with 500-1500; 18% with 1500-3000; and 39% over 3000.

36% of these institutions do not operate a media production unit, but of those who do, only 11% have no other responsibilities in addition to media production. That unit is administered by the same director and staff as the unit housing and distributing software in 57% of the institutions having production units, and 76% locate these facilities in the same building.

Loan of audiovisual equipment is usually done by the AV Center: 56% for classroom use, 50% for individual use. The Library handles this service in 27% of the institutions for classroom use, 26% for individual use. 11% report that there is no loan of equipment for individual use. AV Center staff repair audiovisual equipment in 47% of the colleges, but 31% employ commercial companies; 13% have the media production staff handle repairs, and 4% use library staff.

59% respond that staff dealing with print and non-print materials work closely together as one unit, but only 47% have an integrated staff working as a resource team with faculty in instructional development and/or materials selection. Joint staff meetings of media and library staff occur in 49% of the institutions. Media production staff and library staff coordinate in 46% of the colleges, and differences in titles, status and/or pay exist in 46%. Only 13% of the respondents are seriously considering a staff merger.

50% of the colleges have the Library and AV Center located in the same building, but 87% of those which do not, have most types of media serviced in one building. Media is dispersed throughout the Library by 30% of those responding, and gathered together in a separate area by 63%. As with the smallest size grouping, 62% have different loan policies for print and non-print materials.

An interfiled union catalog including all media is provided by 60% of the respondents and of those answering "No" to this, 58% do provide full cataloging in a separate media catalog; 42% use locally developed standards to perform short cataloging of media. Again, it is usual (73%) to have all cataloging performed in one department.

57% of the college administrations in this size grouping consider the Library and AV Center as one administrative unit and in 65% of those cases, this has always been true; only 20% have merged within the last five years; and only 26% are seriously considering a merger at this time.

17% of the respondents in this group indicate that each separate unit with a separate Director has one of those Directors appointed to coordinate the two units. 39% report that each unit is separate with a separate Director each

reporting to an administrative officer. Within this 39%, 59% report to the same person: the Provost/Vice President, a Dean, another administrative official in that order, with the Provost named twice as often as the Dean.

One individual administers both the AV and library facilities in 55% of the colleges of this size. Their academic preparation includes:

| | Joint AV-Library Director |
|---|---|
| Library degree | 92% |
| Educational media degree | 2% |
| Neither degree, but administrative exper. | 7% |
| Both degrees | 8% |

CVR/dk

## SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS BY SIZE: 3001-5000

The second of the middle grouping size-wise was made to see if there was any point at which colleges tended to go in a different direction simply because of size. It was anticipated that the responses from this group would be closer to those from the immediately preceding group (1501 -3000) than to the largest group. This descriptive analysis of questionnaire responses will not really answer that assumption adequately, but may provide some guides which can be proven or disproven when the statistical analysis is completed. 52% of the colleges are located in urban settings, 24% suburban, and 24% rural. Financial support for this size institution is evenly divided: 52% private, 48% public. Library directors responded to the questionnaire 57% of the time, AV Directors 9% and another individual 27%. Library holdings fell into the upper ranges: 39% holding 150,000-225,000 volumes; 36% owning over 225,000; 21% holding 50,000-150,000; and 3% under 50,000 volumes. Audiovisual holdings, also, grouped at the upper limits of the scale: 33% hold over 3000 titles; 30% have 1500-3000; 24% own 500-1500; and 9% hold under 500.

12% indicate that they lack a media production unit, and of those responding to the questions on that unit, 26% give the media production unit no other responsibilities. That same 26% is administered by its own director and staff separately from the software housing/distribution unit. Within the 75% of production units administered by the same director as the software housing/ distribution unit, 85% are located in the same building.

In 75% of the institutions, audiovisual equipment distribution for classroom use is done through the AV Center, as is 63% of the equipment loan for individual use; in both cases, the Library handles 12%. 21% provide no loan of equipment for individual use. Repair of equipment is accomplished by AV Center staff in 69% of the colleges, with library staff called upon 6% and commercial companies 24%.

A large difference from the previous size group is evident in that only 36% in this group as compared to 59%, feel that staff dealing with print and non-print materials work closely together as one unit; 63% in this group respond in the negative. 54% also reply negatively to the statement that an integrated staff works as a resource team with faculty in instructional development and/or materials selection. Only 36% hold joint media-library staff meetings, and 33% feel that there is any appreciable coordination between library and media production staff. 69% report difference in titles, status and/or pay between these staff members. 18% are seriously considering a staff merger.

Physically, the Library and AV Center are located in the same building in 33% of the institutions, but 59% of those not so located, do service most types of media in one building. Media which is housed in the Library is gathered into a separate area in 81% of the colleges and the same percentage have different loan policies applied to print and non-print materials.

An interfiled union catalog is provided for all types of media in 54% of the responding institutions and 53% of those not having a union catalog do perform complete cataloging and provide access through a separate media catalog. One department handles all materials cataloging in 66% of the colleges.

In this size range, only 24% of the college administrations consider the Library and AV Center to be one administrative unit, and 25% of those so regarded have always been one; 38% have merged within the past five years. Only 17% are now seriously considering a merger.

Agreeing with other institutions regardless of size, 75% have rejected the administrative model which has separate units with separate Directors, one of whom is appointed to Coordinate the units. The same 75% have separate Directors for the separate units reporting to the same administrative officer: 69% to the Provost/Vice President; 56% to a Dean and 7% to another officer. This is one question which was consistently answered by a greater percentage than was anticipated. Only those who responded in the affirmative to the preceding question were asked to answer this question, but, as is obvious, others could not resist. A small 21% of institutions have one director over the two areas, AV and Library, and their credentials include:

| | Joint AV-Library Director |
|---|---|
| Library degree | 100% |
| Educational Media degree | 14% |
| Neither degree, but administrative exper. | 0 |
| Both degrees | 14% |

## SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS BY SIZE: 5001-10,000

10% of total survey responses were received from colleges falling within the largest size range used: 5001-10,000 FTE student body. 50% of these institutions consider their setting to be rural, 38% urban, and a small 11% have a suburban location. 76% of these institutions are publicly funded. Responses to the questionnaire were made by library directors 61%, AV directors 15%, Coordinators 7%, and other individuals 15%. As could be expected for this size grouping, library holdings fell into the two top categories: 88% holding over 225,000 volumes, 12% holding 150,000-225,000 volumes. Again, audiovisual holdings showed a different pattern. While 65% of the institutions own more than 3000 audiovisual titles, 19% own between 1500 and 3000, 12% between 500 and 1500, and 4% under 500 titles.

23% have no media production unit. Of the 77% reporting such a unit, 35% hold the unit responsible only for production. 20% have their own director and staff while 75% are administered by the same director as the unit housing and distributing the software, and 73% are located in the same building.

88% of the institutions distribute audiovisual equipment for classroom use and 84% for individual use, through the AV Center; 7% have no equipment loan for individual use. The equipment is kept in repair by AV Center staff in 57% of the institutions and by commercial companies in 26%.

Staff dealing with print and non-print materials work closely together as one unit in 50% of the colleges, and in 38% they work with faculty as an integrated staff for instructional development and/or materials selection. 46% of the institutions included both library and media staff in staff meetings. 38% feel that library and media production staff coordinate their efforts to an appreciable degree, but 69% indicate a difference between these staff members in titles, status and/or pay. 15% of the institutions are seriously considering a staff merger.

When the physical proximity of AV centers and libraries is considered, 57% are located in the same building, and 50% of those which are not, do service most types of media in one building. Media in the library is gathered together in a separate area in 80% of the colleges, and 88% have different loan periods for print and non-print materials.

An interfiled union catalog including audiovisual as well as print materials is provided in 57% of the institutions and only 27% of those without a union catalog provide full cataloging for media in a separate catalog. However, 64% without a union catalog or full media cataloging do provide some sort of short cataloging according to locally developed standards. Whichever method of bibliographic access is selected, 61% do all cataloging in one department.

Within these larger institutions, there exists a 50-50 split as to whether or not the college administration considers the Library and AV Center to be one unit administratively. It is interesting to note that these areas have always existed as one unit in only 8% of the institutions, while the merger has occurred within the past five years in 38%, and only 8% are now making serious consideration of such a merger. As far as organizational lines, 76% have rejected the concept of two separate units each with its own director, but one director appointed as Coordinator. 50% of the institutions have each unit with its own

director reporting to an administrative officer. 69% report to the same administrator: of which more than 60% report to the Provost/Vice President, the remaining to a Dean. The 50% who report that the AV Center and the Library have one Director, report the following qualifications for that incumbent:

| | Joint AV-Library Director |
|---|---|
| Library degree | 100% |
| Educational media degree | 8% |
| Neither degree, but admin. experience | 0 |
| Both degrees | 23% |

CVR/dk
6/83

## REFERENCES


Akeroyd, R. (1973). Non-print media integration: The University of Connecticut Library. Storrs, Conn.: University of Connecticut. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 081 437)

American Library Association. Association of College and Research Libraries. (1968). Guidelines for A-V services in academic libraries. Chicago, Ill.: American Library Association.

American Library Association. Association of College and Research Libraries. (1975). Standards for College Libraries. College and Research Libraries News, 36, 277-279, 290-301.

Asheim, L. (1977). Introduction to "Differentiating the media". In D. Boyle (Ed.), Expanding media (pp. 41-51). Phoenix, Arizona: Oryx Press.

Bartlett, R.C. (1968). Projection of guidelines for the multi-media center. North Central Association Quarterly, 43, 225.

Boyle, D. (1977). Expanding media. Phoenix, Arizona: Oryx Press.

Brown, J.W. (1973). New media in higher education. Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education.

Burlingame, D.F. (1974). A comparative study of organizational characteristics used in learning resources centers and traditionally organized library and audio-visual service facilities in four Minnesota and Wisconsin Senior colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 101 686)

Burlingame, D.F. (1976). Them's fightin' words: Media in the library. Audiovisual Instruction, 21(8), 25-26.

California Commission on Higher Education. (1964). Learning resources for colleges and universities. Hayward, California: The College.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1972). The Fourth revolution; Instructional technology in higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Daniel, E.H. (1975). Learning resources survey of non-print materials and equipment for the libraries of the California State University and Colleges, 1975.

Chico, California: California State University and Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 111 388)

Ducote, R.L. (1972, July-August). Spiraling patterns in college libraries. American Libraries, pp.733-734.

Ellison, J.W. (1973). The concept of college and university learning resources centers. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 077 229)

Ely, D.P. (1971, May). The contemporary college library: change by evolution or revolution. Educational Technology, pp. 17-19.

Enright, B.J. (1972). New media and the library in education. London, Clive Bingley.

Faris, G. (1969). An A-V Center that practices what it preaches. American School and University, 41, 47.

Final report of the Task Force on Instructional Media. (1972). Chico, California: Chico State College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 087 473)

Hardesty, L., & Bentley, S. (1980). The use and effectiveness of the 1975 "Standards for College Libraries": A survey of college library directors. Unpublished manuscript, DePauw University, Roy O. West Library, Greencastle, Indiana.

Hickey, D.D. (1977). The impact of instructional technology on the future of academic librarianship. In H. Poole (Ed.), Academic libraries by the year 2000 (pp. 34-49). New York: R.R. Bowker.

Howard, H.A. (1974). Administrative integration of information resources and services in universities in Canada and the U.S. Washington, D.C.: Council on Library Resources. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 096 945)

Langhoff, H.F. (1980). Learning resource centers: Organizational components and structural models. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 222 180)

Learning materials and services at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. (1974). Charlotte, North Carolina: The University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 107 260)

Le Clerq, A. (1977). Collecting non-print media in academic libraries. In D. Boyle (Ed.), Expanding media (pp. 69-75). Phoenix, Arizona: Oryx Press.

Lewis, P. (1971). Introduction to new dimensions in educational technology for multi-media centers. Library Trends, 19, 399-400.

McPheeter, V.W. (1980). Learning resources centers - Past, present & future, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 222 180).

Massman, V.F. (1977). Changes that will affect college library collection development. In H. Poole (Ed.), Academic libraries by the year 2000 (pp. 152-164). New York: R.R. Bowker.

Merren, J. (1975). Catalog of college and university learning centers. Audiovisual Instruction, 20, 15-22.

Morein, P.G. (1982). Clifford Library and Learning Resources self-study report, Evansville, Indiana. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 225 581)

Morison, S.E. (1946). Three centuries of Harvard, 1636-1936, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Mustico, T.W. (1981). CHISQ/BAS, (Computer program). Oswego, NY: CLEAR-80. (State University of New York at Oswego).

Mustico, T.W. (1983). RANDONCE/BAS, (Computer program). Oswego, NY: CLEAR-80. (State University of New York at Oswego).

Nelson, D.E. (1981). University libraries and instructional media facilities: Present and future relationships, Summary and comparison of responses from 1971 and 1980 questionnaires. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Association for Educational Communication and Technology, Philadelphia, Pa., April 6-10, 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 208 835)

Osterman, D.N. (1980). What's happening with instructional development and media? A research project, Corvallis, Oregon: Information Futures. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 190 124)

Quinly, W.J. (1971) Carrels for learning. Library Trends, 29, 467-474.

Shores, L. (1973). Audiovisual librarianship: The crusade for media unity (1946-1969). Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited.

Stone, C.W. (1969). Planning for media within university library buildings. Library Trends, 18, 235-245.

Taylor, R.S. (1972). The making of a library: the academic library in transition. New York: Becker & Hayes.

Taylor University. (1980). Small library planning program report of a self-study Sept. 1979-April 1980, Directed by the Office of Management Studies of the Association of Research Libraries funded by Lilly Endowment. Upland, Indiana. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 215 673)

Timpano, D.N. (1970). Crisis in educational technology. New York: Gilbert.

Totten, H.L. (1977). Library education and non-print media: Where it's at. In D. Boyle (Ed.), Expanding media (pp. 279-284). Phoenix, Arizona: Oryx Press.

Walter, E.M. (1982). The library, Chapter VI, the Southern Association of Colleges and School Institutional self-study. Florence, Alabama: Northern Alabama University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 221 167)

Wheelbarger, J.J. (1973). The learning resource center at the four-year college level. Audiovisual Instruction, 18, 89.